
VOL. III. OCTOBER, 1908. NO. 1.

MISSOURI
HISTORICAL
REVIEW.



PUBLISHED BY
THE STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY
OF MISSOURI

F. A. SAMPSON, Secretary,
EDITOR.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$1.00 PER YEAR
ISSUED QUARTERLY.

COLUMBIA, MO.

ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MAIL MATTER AT COLUMBIA, MO., JULY 16, 1897

MISSOURI HISTORICAL REVIEW.

EDITOR

FRANCIS A. SAMPSON.

Committee on Publication:

JONAS VILES, ISIDOR LOEB, F. A. SAMPSON.

VOL. III.

OCTOBER, 1908.

NO. I.

CONTENTS

Notes on the Jones family in Missouri, by Prof. G. C. Broadhead,	1
Some Historical Lines of Missouri, by Judge John L. Thomas,	5
Bryant's Station and its Founder, William Bry- ant, by Thomas William Bryant,	34
A German Communistic Society in Missouri, by Wm. Godfrey Bek,	52
Notes	75
Book Notes	79
Necrology	81
Department of Teachers of History and Govern- ment,	85



MISSOURI

HISTORICAL REVIEW.

VOL. 3.

OCTOBER, 1908,)

NO. 1

NOTES ON THE JONES FAMILY IN MISSOURI

The Joneses are chiefly of Welsh descent, and they may be found wherever the English language is spoken. We have read of John Paul Jones and his exploits as a naval officer, fighting for the cause of American freedom, on the high seas, during the Revolutionary war. But he really was not named Jones, only John Paul. In Missouri the Jones family has been distinguished for lawyers, doctors and ministers of the gospel and politicians and educators.

John Rice Jones came from Virginia to Indiana and then to Missouri in 1808. He was a member of the Constitutional convention of 1820, then judge of the Supreme Court and died in 1824. He was of Welsh descent. His son, George W. Jones, was United States Senator from the State of Iowa, and his son was my schoolmate at the Western Military Institute at Drennon Springs, Ky, in 1851 and 1852.

Charles Jones came from Virginia to Franklin county, Missouri, and was a leading member of the State Senate, and died in St. Louis in 1876. Breckenridge Jones is a prominent lawyer and banker of St. Louis. The Rev. Isaac Jones, a Presbyterian preacher, dwelt in Columbia for a number of years, notably between 1840 and 1860. His house was on

the east side of Eighth street between Broadway and the old City Hotel. A. H. Jones, a bachelor, living north of Columbia, deserves notice for his generosity in giving \$15,000 to the new Y. M. C. A. building.

James Jones was an early settler in Montgomery county, and for many years before the Wabash Railroad came along, his house was the regular stopping place for stages. In the month of January, 1848, I staid one night with Mr. Jones. The house, a log, was standing right in the center of the town of Jonesborough until about 1904, being about 100 yards east of the Wabash Depot and about 200 feet north of the Railroad.

Dr. John Jones resided near Marthasville in Warren county. He took an active part in ferretting out the horse thieves who infested the country prior to 1845, and for this, he was secretly assassinated in 1842. This caused great excitement at the time, and some persons were arrested on suspicion, but nothing could be proven against any one. I was then but a boy, yet I remember hearing of it.

Lewis Jones, was a famous hunter in early times. Once he went so far from home as the Platte, was taken prisoner by the Indians, stripped of all his clothes, given an old gun and turned loose. He started home, and on the way shot a panther, skinned it and put the skin on himself, and traveled in this way for several hundred miles to his home in Montgomery county. The skin being fresh when put on, there was some trouble in cutting it and taking it off.

John Jones, a native of Wales and a sailor, sailed around the world, and between 1890 and 1902 was employed as night watchman on the U. S. snagboat Charles R. Suter. At his leisure he employed himself in weaving cords around chains, canes, bell ropes, &c., and making baskets. His work was pretty and showed science and skill. I have a cane showing his workmanship that he presented to me.

Jefferson F. Jones of Welsh origin came with his parents from Kentucky to Boone county, Mo., in 1824. A few years later he settled in Callaway. He was a successful lawyer and was a leader among the people. He used his influence

in promoting the building of the North Missouri Railroad. He was a member of the Legislatures of 1856 and 1875, and was energetic and faithful to his ideas of his duty. He was a strong sympathizer for the South, and raised a company for the purpose of fighting in the southern cause. In this he was checked by Gen. John B. Henderson, and had to sign articles to relinquish his purpose.

William Claude Jones was a member of the Constitutional convention of 1845, and in 1846 a member of the State Senate from Newton county. In 1849 he was a member of the Board of Curators of the State University. Soon after, he went to California, and died there a few years later. He composed the following song to the air of Lucy Neale:

1. Where the wild Neosho winds and kisses many a flower
The prairie deck'd in beauty smil'd, around the red
man's bower;
Joy's mellow voice was there, there love's sweet voice was
heard,
And the warrior press'd to his throbbing breast,
The lovely Prairie bird!

Chorus:

Oh the Prairie bird, the lovely Prairie bird
And the warrior press'd to his breast
The lovely Prairie bird!

2. The flow'rs of spring had bloomed, and the warrior sought
the plain
Where the Buffalo in grandeur roamed,
In a wild and stately train.
While the warrior's arm did thin many a lordly herd
The wild Comanche bore away his lovely prairie bird.

Chorus: Oh the Prairie bird, &c.

3. In Neosho's flow'ry vale, his wigwam wild was lorn
Where his heart's sweet flow'r--his gem of hope
His prairie bird was gone.

The smile which won his love, each cherished look
and word
Rose in the warrior's heart, and he wished to save the
prairie bird.

Chorus: Oh the Prairie bird, &c.

John P. Jones came from Massachusetts to Missouri, and was Post Master at Keytesville, Mo., between 1876 and 1890. While living there he made an extensive archaeological collection of flints and stone implements which he disposed of to Central Park, New York. He then turned his attention to early Missouri history. Interesting articles on these subjects may be found in Vols. 4, 5, and 6 of the Kansas City Review of Science and Industry for 1880 and 1883. Sometime about 1890 he went to Southwest Kansas, and then to California, and was in San Diego in 1896, engaged in studying out the travels of the early Spanish explorers. In a letter to me he says that he crossed the Rocky Mountains on the same trail that Lewis and Clark did in 1805 and that it has been used ever since, and was in use earlier than the time of Lewis and Clark.

John Carlton Jones was born in Kentucky. In 1882 he began to teach Latin in the Missouri University, and has now been so employed for twenty-five years. He was assistant and then Secretary of the Faculty. In 1891 he became full professor in charge of the Latin Department, and now, for several years has been Dean of the Academic Faculty.

Joneses may be found throughout the State of Missouri, and many of them have been prominent and influential, and we do not recall that any have not performed their part well.

G. C. BROADHEAD.

SOME HISTORICAL LINES OF MISSOURI.

Missouri is entitled to be regarded as the keystone State of the American Union rather than Pennsylvania. Her geographical position made her the highway and the principal theatre of all the early explorers. A hundred years ago all western roads pointed to our state, and for a half century they ended at or in her borders. Her eastern shore is laved by the mightiest river of the world; the great Missouri bisects her territory, and the Ohio with its drain arteries extending into New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, strikes her border sixty miles above her southeastern border as the bird flies, and more than twice that distance probably by the meanderings of the great river. Missouri lies between 36° 30' and 40° 34' 40" north latitude, and between these two lines the fiercest contests, political and military, of the country, were fought to a finish and settled.

The Missouri Compromise Line.

It turns out that the most important line in our history, The Missouri Compromise Line, coincides almost in its whole extent with the southern boundary of our state, and before going into the history of the former I will briefly state the history of the establishment of the latter.

The first petition for the admission of Missouri into the Union was prepared and signed in the fall of 1817, and on March 17, 1818, John Scott, our delegate to Congress, presented this petition to the House and it was referred to a committee. This petition asked that the southern boundary of the state be fixed at 30° 30' north latitude, stating that that was an extension of the line between Virginia and North Carolina and Kentucky and Tennessee. November 22, 1818, the Territorial Legislature of Missouri adopted a memorial which was

presented to Congress, praying that the southern line of the new state be fixed as follows: Beginning on the Mississippi at the line of 36° north latitude and running thence to the junction of Big Black and White Rivers; thence up the main fork of White River to 36° 30' and thence west, etc. There were two settlements between the lines proposed by the peoples' petition and the legislative memorial, one along the river in what is now Pemiscot county and the other on White and Black Rivers and probably a few on the St. Francois. At that time there was a county called Lawrence, composed of a strip of territory now within the limits of this state, about thirty miles wide, extending from the St. Francois River to the western border of the state, and running to Little Red River on the south, with its county seat at Davidsonville, which was near the present site of Pocahontas, New Madrid county, with its county seat at the town of New Madrid included the settlements along the river in what is now Pemiscot county. As soon as the agitation for the admission of Missouri began, an effort was made to organize the Arkansas Territory. This brought the question of the boundary line of the State of Missouri and the Territory of Arkansas to the front, and the line as it stands today was agreed on. That line was a compromise. The settlers along the Mississippi prayed that their business and political relations with the other citizens of New Madrid county be not severed by cutting them off from their county seat. Their wishes prevailed and what has sometimes been called "Missouri's Toe" (Pemiscot and Dunklin counties) was added to Missouri. And for a like reason the settlers along White and Black Rivers with their county seat, Davidsonville, were included in the bounds of Arkansas Territory. The bill to admit Missouri was passed by the House on February 17, 1819, and on the day that bill passed, a bill to organize the Arkansas Territory was introduced into the House. The latter bill became a law March 2nd, 1819, but the Missouri bill was lost March 3rd of the same year, and did not become a law until more than a year afterwards, so the Act March 2, 1819, organizing Arkansas Territory, first fixed the line 36° from the Mississippi to the St.

Francois, and 36° 30' from that river west as the northern line of Arkansas, and by the act of March 6, 1820, that line was made the southern line of Missouri. The starting point on the Mississippi for this line had its inception in an act of the Missouri Territorial Legislature of December 31, 1813, defining the line between New Madrid and Arkansas counties. That line began at the lower end of Island No. 19 (near the line of 36°), and ran thence to the mouth of Little Red River and thence up that river to the western line of the "Osage Purchase." That was before Lawrence county, which was bounded east by the St. Francois, was formed.

The line between Arkansas and Missouri was for many years a source of annoyance to the settlers along the border of the two jurisdictions. January 21, 1821, the Missouri Legislature prayed the Government at Washington to survey this line and locate it, which was done in 1823 by Joseph C. Brown, under appointment of Wm. C. Rector, Surveyor General of Missouri and Illinois. But the friction between the settlers along the above line continued for a long time. Finally, February 11, 1841, the Missouri Legislature authorized the Governor to appoint a commissioner to act with one from Arkansas to survey and more exactly fix and mark the line. Under this act, Governor Marmaduke appointed Ex-Governor Daniel Dunklin to make the survey, and he and the commissioner from Arkansas commenced the work, but on July 25, 1844, Dunklin died. George Penn, of Saline county, was appointed vice Dunklin, and by November, 1844, sixty miles of the line had been surveyed. Afterwards the whole survey was finished and the line, reported by the joint commissioners, was ratified by Arkansas by Act of December 23, 1846, by Missouri by Act of February 16, 1847, and by Congress by Act of February 15, 1848.

The Adoption of the Missouri Compromise Line.

The establishment of the boundary line between Missouri and Arkansas had no political significance whatever. but out of its establishment grew the first great slavery agitation in our country, which resulted in the adoption of what is known

in history as the Missouri Compromise Line. This was the fourth compromise on the slavery question. In the formation of the constitution there had been three compromises on this subject:

First. The Fugitive Slave Clause.

Second. Three fifths of the slaves (called "other persons" to avoid the use of the word "slave" in the Constitution) were to be reckoned as a basis of representation in the lower House of Congress and for taxation.

Third. The Foreign Slave Trade might be abolished after the year 1808.

From the time of the adoption of these three compromises, 1787-89 to the adoption of the fourth in 1820, was what might be termed the tranquil period in our national history in regard to slavery agitation. The first suggestion of a line dividing slave and free soil came from Mr. Louis McLane, of Delaware, during the discussion of the bills to admit Missouri as a State, and to organize the Territory of Arkansas in 1819. February 15, 1819, Mr. Talmage, of New York, proposed a scheme for the gradual emancipation of slaves in Missouri, and on February 17, 1819, Mr. Taylor, of New York also, proposed the same scheme for Arkansas. February 15th Mr. McLane suggested a line, without naming any particular line, however, equitably dividing the territory west of the Mississippi between the contending parties, as a compromise. Mr. Taylor's emancipation scheme for Arkansas was defeated in the House February 17, 1819, by a vote of 68 to 80. The same day Mr. Taylor introduced, for the first time in the history of the country, an amendment to the Arkansas bill, fixing the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ as a dividing line between slavery and freedom. The same day Mr. Harrison proposed that this line should run due west from the mouth of the Des Moines river. After a heated debate Mr. Taylor withdrew his amendment to the Arkansas bill, and that Territory was organized by Act March 2, 1819, without restrictions as to slavery. As has been noted, the Missouri bill, on account of the slavery question, was lost the next day, March 3, 1819. At the next session the Missouri bill was re-introduced, and Mr. Talmage renewed his amendment, providing

for the gradual emancipation of the slaves of Missouri. The scheme was to prohibit in the future the importation of any more slaves into the state, and to make all children born of slave mothers free after the age of twenty-five years. At that time there were in the State about eleven thousand slaves. Most of the leading statesmen of Missouri, including her representative in Congress, John Scott, and her two future senators, Benton and Barton, opposed this emancipation scheme, and insisted on the admission of the state without conditions as to slavery. It is proper to state, however, that the citizens of Missouri were, by no means, unanimous in making the institution of slavery permanent in this state. In April, 1820, a meeting of about one hundred citizens of St. Louis was held, presided over by Joseph Charless, at which it was resolved that the further importation of slaves into the state be stopped as soon as possible. The debate in Congress became bitter and memorable. The agitation growing out of it, which was simply a renewal of the agitation at the preceding session, continued for weeks, exciting the passions of both sides almost to the point of sundering the bonds of our union. A compromise, the fourth on the slavery question, was finally reached. This compromise, proposed by Senator Jesse B. Thomas, of Illinois, provided that slavery should not exist in any of the territory acquired by us from France in 1803 north of 36° 30' north latitude, except Missouri, which might be admitted as a slave state. Please note this exception as important, as will be developed hereafter. This line was adopted by Act of Congress March 6, 1820. Note this date also as an epoch marker.

Thomas Jefferson, in a letter to Holt, April 13, 1820, referring to the measure said: "The coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived, I feared would never more be obliterated from the mind." He added that he feared that the union was doomed, and went so far as to suggest a line of cleavage, the Potomac, Ohio and Missouri, or probably the Mississippi rivers (meaning, of course, the Mississippi north of the Ohio). A week later, in a letter to Holmes, he said: "This momentous ques-

tion, like a fire bell at night, awakened me and filled me with terror. I considered it at once the knell of the Union." He added that his one comfort was that he would not live to see the catastrophe. As an index to the feeling of our State at the time on this question, and as exemplifying the trend of political action of this period, I will state that the grand juries of St. Louis, St. Charles and Jefferson counties (and there may have been more) made reports to their respective courts, asserting the dogma of states rights and severely criticizing Congress for its action in connection with the establishment of this line. Mr. Jefferson was mistaken when he suggested that the establishment of this line introduced a new element in American politics. "The coincidence of a marked principle, normal and political, with a geographical line," existed at the time of the adoption of the Missouri Compromise, and had existed for over half a century. Jeremiah Mason and Charles Dixon, two celebrated English surveyors, had fixed and marked the line between Pennsylvania on one side and Delaware and Maryland on the other in 1760-67, and while that line had no political significance at the time it was surveyed, it, in time came to be universally recognized in this country as the line dividing slave from free territory. In 1787 this line, as a divisional one between slavery and freedom, was extended along the Ohio to its mouth and from the ocean to the mouth of the Ohio it became recognized as Mason and Dixon's line. On one side of it lay the South; on the other side the North. On this side slavery existed, on that freedom prevailed. Here was slave soil and slave labor, there was free soil and free labor. This line, at first a purely imaginary one, in time became a chasm and finally became the battle line of the contending forces. This line divided the States, while the Missouri Compromise, when established, divided only the territories of the United States, then largely uninhabited.

If the line between the free and slave States, the Ohio river, had been extended westward, it would nearly have coincided with the southern line of Missouri, as fixed by the Act of March 6, 1820. Benton, in his abridgement of Con-

gressional Debates, Vol. 6, p. 430, says, a proposition was made in Congress in 1811 to extend this line westward from the mouth of the Ohio. It is probable that both sides agreed to the Missouri Compromise under a serious misconception of the character of the Louisiana Purchase, outside of Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa and Minnesota, as geographers of that day marked nearly all of the territory west of the Missouri as the "Great American Desert." By this mutual mistake both sides did not think that they were surrendering very much in fixing the line they did between slave and free soil.

The Missouri Compromise Line, as established by Act of March 6, 1820, extended no further west than the 100° west longitude, which had been fixed as the western line of the Louisiana Purchase south of the Arkansas River, by the treaty with Spain in 1819, but by the Act of Congress, 1845, fixing the boundary of Texas, it was provided that if any states should, in the future, be formed out of Texas territory, slavery should not exist north of 36° 30', which had the effect to extend the Missouri Compromise Line to the Rio Grande. Afterwards when other territories were organized, a narrow strip of land nearly 200 miles long and 35 miles wide, lying between 36° 30' and 37° North latitude and 100° and 103° west longitude was not included in any of them, and was for a long time known as "No Man's Land" but it was finally attached to Oklahoma, and now forms Beaver County of that State.

February 15, 1847, when it had become manifest that an extensive territory would be acquired from Mexico, and when the agitation growing out of the Wilmot proviso, which sought to prohibit slavery in our acquisitions from Mexico, was again convulsing the country, the Missouri Legislature adopted resolutions instructing the Senators and requesting the Representatives from Missouri, to abide by the Missouri Compromise Line in the organization of future governments for the territories then owned or that might, in the future, be owned by us. Thus as late as 1847

the Missouri Legislature had no thought and probably no desire to disturb that line.

March 10, 1849, the same Legislature adopted what are known as the "Jackson Resolutions," which asserted the doctrine of State Sovereignty and of States Rights, and alligned Missouri with the extremists of the South. These resolutions asserted further that Congress had no power to prohibit slavery in any of the territories of the United States, "but for the sake of harmony and the preservation of the Federal Union they will still sanction the application of the principles of the Missouri Compromise to the recent acquisitions, if by such concessions, future aggressions upon the equal rights of the States may be arrested and the spirit of anti-slavery fanaticism extinguished." By the resolutions the Senators from Missouri were instructed and her Representatives requested, to vote in accordance with the principles they announced on all questions coming within their purview. The great Benton revolted against these resolutions, and in 1849-50 made his memorable appeal to the people and thereby lost his place in the Senate, to the irreparable loss of the State. The defeat of Benton marked an important epoch in Missouri history, for by it our State passed from the conservative leadership of Bentonism to the radical leadership of anti-Bentonism, to continue up to the flight of Governor Jackson across her southern line in 1861, a period of ten years. It ought never to be forgotten, however, that though Benton was defeated, his memorable appeal did more than any other one thing to make Missouri Union in sentiment. He charged that the "Jackson Resolutions" spelled secession and disunion, which forced his enemies to deny this; and to fortify them in this denial, to vociferously assert that they loved the Union and would do all they could to maintain it. Hence, on this appeal, all were, publicly at least, for the Union, with this distinction; Benton and his adherents were for the Union first and slavery afterwards, while the anti-Bentonites were for slavery first and the Union afterwards. This contest did not end with the defeat of Benton. He and his adherents con-

tinued it until his defeat for Governor in 1856, when he retired from public life. He had, however, sown the seeds of Unionism, which germinated and brought forth abundant fruit. When the crisis came, February 28, 1861, the State adhered to the Union by a vote of 80,000 majority. It should be noted at this point that the Missouri Legislature, on the 21st day of February, 1861, just seven days before this decisive vote for the Union, by joint resolution declared against coercion, and "that in case of invasion of any Southern State to carry that doctrine into effect, the people of Missouri will instantly rally on the side of their southern brethren to resist the invasions at all hazards and to the last extremity," which shows that representative bodies do not always represent.

In 1850 other compromise measures were adopted, as follows:

- 1st. California was admitted as a free State.
- 2nd. New Mexico, its north line extending to the Arkansas river, and Utah, were organized as territories, and authorized to come into the Union free or slave, as they chose.
- 3rd. The Fugitive Slave law was strengthened.
- 4th. The slave trade in the District of Columbia was prohibited. These made eight compromises on the subject of slavery, and thus ended the compromising era of our country.

The Fugitive Slave Law.

The Fugitive Slave Law was always intensely unpopular in the North, and the one of 1850 was denounced more bitterly than the one of 1793, as it required the citizens of the North, when called on by the officers of the law, to become "slave catchers," as they called it. They claimed that it was asking too much to require them, by law, to help capture and return to slavery men and women, though black, fleeing by their doors to make themselves free, or forbidden to feed them or give them shelter.

Uncle Tom's Cabin.

Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe published "Uncle Tom's Cabin" in 1851-52, as a protest against the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. She makes heroes and heroines of the men and women who refused to obey that law by feeding and clothing fugitive slaves and aiding them in their flight to freedom. She also portrays, in strong dramatic colors, the inhumanity of breaking up the family life and sundering the ties between parents and children, husbands and wives of the slaves of the South by their sale and separation. She sarcastically refers to the fact that fugitive slaves had to be clandestinely conducted through a free country to a province of a monarchy, Canada, before they could be free. Mrs. Stowe appealed chiefly to the men and women of the North, but she did not ignore the South. Her work struck a sympathetic cord in the human heart everywhere, and it met with an immense sale. The result was, lines known as "underground railroads," were established from Mason and Dixon's line to Canada for the escape of fugitive slaves, and by means of which many did escape. This angered the South, and its statesmen insisted that the North had already abrogated the Missouri Compromise, at least in its spirit, and they began again to seriously discuss the question whether Congress possessed the power to exclude slavery from any of the territories of the United States, and by 1854, they were ready to overthrow the Missouri Compromise Line.

At that time, (1854), the two Senators of Missouri, David R. Atchison, a democrat, and Henry S. Geyer, a whig, and all the Representatives in the House, except Benton, then a member of that body, were extreme pro-slavery men.

The Churches Divided.

In the meantime the line of demarkation between slave and free soil had become a disturbing element in the churches. The Methodist body had split along that line in 1844, and the Presbyterians and Baptists soon followed

This schism distinctly emphasized the moral and religious phase of the question involved and aligned religionists, North and South of this dividing line, into separate groups. Nearly all the members of the religious bodies in the slave States, became political adherents of the pro-slave idea, and nearly all in the free States became political adherents of the free soil cause. This alignment intensified the situation and embittered the controversy.

It is important in this connection to refer to another significant episode in the history of Missouri. January 16, 1833, the Missouri Legislature formed a new county and named it Van Buren, in honor of the Vice-President of the United States. February 16, 1841, the same Legislature, by joint resolutions, addressed Mr. Van Buren, as President of the United States, tendering him its regard, esteem and confidence, and complimenting him on his firm stand for the rights of slaveholders "against the operations of a party, which is led by the world's convention of England and is rendered formidable by its association with the capitalists of London and many of our deluded citizens," and on his opposition to the measure to allow the postoffice to carry abolition documents. Van Buren was defeated for the nomination for President in the democratic convention of 1844, and in 1848 he ran for President on a free soil platform, and thus caused the defeat of Lewis Cass, the candidate of the democratic party on a state's rights platform, and March 7, 1849, the same Legislature changed the name of Van Buren county to Cass. How fickle is fame! The Legislature in changing the name of Van Buren county discreetly omitted its reasons for so doing. In this, Missouri showed herself more radical than Arkansas, which has allowed the name of Van Buren to designate one of her counties even to this day.

David R. Atchison.

This gentleman, who succeeded Dr. Linn in the Senate in the fall of 1844, was the antipode of Benton, the other Senator. Benton, while pro-slavery, was an unconditional

Union man. Atchison was for the Union but not without slavery; the former was consistent, the latter inconsistent, as his public career will show. Senator Atchison, March 10, 1848, after our acquisitions from Mexico, the largest portion of which lay south of the line of $36^{\circ} 30'$ voted to extend the Missouri Compromise Line to the Pacific and so did Benton on the organization of Oregon Territory, but subsequently, fearing that the bill would be lost with that provision in it, Benton and other men were willing to omit it but Atchison insisted on retaining it. Again on the adoption of the Compromise measures of 1850, Mr. Atchison voted to extend the Missouri Compromise line to California, but he was again defeated and this time he went so far as to join Jeff. Davis, R. M. T. Hunter and some other southern men in a protest against its non-extension. This protest asserted that the refusal to extend that line to California "was fatal to the peace and equality of the States.....and leading, if persisted in, to a dissolution of the Confederacy." Atchison's change of base will be noticed under the next sub-head.

The Abrogation of the Missouri Compromise Line.

In the winter of 1853, a bill for the organization of the Territory of Nebraska was before the Senate, and Mr. Atchison stated that, while he did not consider the Missouri Compromise Line as just, he had come to the conclusion that it could not be repealed, and hence it might be considered as permanent, and he was willing to organize the Territory on that theory. But by the next session a change had come over the spirit of his dream, and he became a persistent advocate of the abrogation of that line. In January, 1854, Mr. Douglas, chairman of the Committee on Territories, made a report on the Nebraska bill, in which it was recommended that the line $36^{\circ} 30'$ be disturbed; but finally he changed his mind and reported a bill to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, and recommended that this historic line be abrogated. Mr. Atchison, in a speech

at Atchison, Kas., September 20, 1854, gave the reason for this change of base on the part of Senator Douglas. In that speech he told the people that he had forced Douglas to take that step by telling him that if he did not report an amendment to the bill to abrogate that line, he, (Atchison), would resign as Vice-President, be put at the head of the Territorial Committee, and report such a measure himself. And he went on to say that Douglas yielded, and on May 30, 1854, Mr. Pierce signed the bill, with that provision in it, wiping out the Missouri Compromise Line, and leaving the people of the Territories free to adopt or reject slavery at their own option. May 30, 1854, thus becomes one of the most memorable days in the history of our country, and especially in the history of Missouri. That day was the beginning of the end of slavery, and of the dogma of peaceable secession. Jefferson was mistaken about the establishment of the Missouri Compromise Line being an error, sufficient to cause alarm, but his criticism of that line and his prophecy in regard to it exactly fit the crisis reached May 30, 1854, when that line was abrogated. The abrogation of that line came like a clap of thunder out of a clear sky and it fell upon the ears of the people like a fire alarm at night, filling them with alarm and indignation. The North was ripe for decisive action. This line which had been regarded as sacred as the Constitution itself and as a measure of peace for over thirty-four years was wiped out, and the proposition to carry slavery into all the Territories aroused a storm of wrath and indignation throughout the North, and the determination was at once formed to fight the institution to a finish everywhere. The pulpit, platform and press, along the whole line of the free States hurled their anathemas against what they termed the oppressions of the slave power, urging that that power proposed to nationalize slavery. The anti-slavery people asserted it had been the hope of the fathers, Southern as well as Northern, that slavery would in time be put in the way of final extinction, and that hope had been theirs up to May 30, 1854, but by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise

Line, they were forced to the conclusion that the slaveholders intended to extend that institution with the deep-seated determination to perpetuate it. This they intended to resist to the last extremity. The conflict between freedom and slavery in their minds became irrepressible. The South insisted that slaves were mere chattels, on a par with horses and cattle, and as such, slaveholders had a right to carry them into the Territories of the United States where the Constitution threw its protecting arm around them, not to free them, but to enslave them. And when the slaveholders, with the Bible in one hand and the Constitution in the other, asserted that by the first they could prove slavery right and by the other legal, the anti-slavery people replied that if that was true, which they denied, they would demand an anti-slavery God, and anti-slavery Bible and an anti-slavery Constitution, and that they would appeal to a law higher than the Constitution or institutions, the law of eternal justice and love of humanity. The assertion of a Divine sanction for slavery, and the further assertion that slaves were mere chattels, things to be treated like other property and that when the masters moved to the Territories with their slaves, they carried with them also the law of slavery of their own States, shocked the whole North, and the assertion of the higher law doctrine shocked the whole South.

In the repeal of the Missouri Compromise Line by the slaveholding States chiefly, the South unwittingly threw down the gauntlet of war, which the North promptly took up and the two antagonistic civilizations buckled on their armor for the conflict. In the North this conflict was intended to be to a finish from the start. There were to be no more palliations or compromises; but the South, having avowedly adopted the Kansas-Nebraska bill as a peace measure, as it was termed, did not awake to a full realization of the nature of the conflict it had precipitated for two or three years afterwards.

Kansas Becomes the Battlefield.

The effect of the abrogation of the Missouri Compromise Line, instead of calming the troubled waters of slavery agitation, simply transferred the contest from the halls of Congress to the plains of Kansas, which became at once the center of the stage, and remained such for three years.

Emigrant Aid Societies.

The portents of the coming storm had already, by the time the Kansas-Nebraska bill became a law, induced the people of Massachusetts to organize Emigrant Aid Societies to make Kansas a free State, and in a short time Missourians, under the leadership of Atchison, B. F. Stringfellow, Claiborne F. Jackson, and others organized secret, oath-bound Blue Lodges, Social Bands and Sons of the South, afterwards joined by organized bands from South Carolina and Georgia, to make Kansas a slave State. These methods, on both sides, were new in American politics and tended to intensify and embitter the struggle.

The Republican Party.

An anti-slavery party, the Republican, sprang up as if by magic, the sole inspiration of which was "free speech, free soil and free men" and around this sentiment the anti-slavery forces became coherent, persistent and determined. The struggle in Kansas was fierce and bloody. March 30, 1855, large numbers of armed Missourians invaded that Territory and elected a pro-slavery Legislature, which became "the direful spring of woes unnumbered" to both Kansas and Missouri. May 21, 1856, Sheriff Jones and his posse, composed of Missourians very largely, sacked Lawrence and destroyed two free State newspapers. May 24, 1856, old John Brown appears upon the scene at Dutch Henry's Crossing, Kas., where he and his companions killed five pro-slavery men in a most cruel and wanton manner. The free State people from March 30, 1855, when the Mis-

sourians elected a Kansas Legislature, refused to recognize that Legislature as legal or the government it established as entitled to their allegiance, and organized a State government of their own, formed a constitution known as the "Topeka Constitution," and under it applied for admission into the Union as a free State. The anti-slavery members of Congress supported this free State government, and voted to admit Kansas as a free State under the Topeka Constitution, while the pro-slavery members, backed by the administration fought both as illegal and revolutionary.

The Sumner-Brooks Episode.

May 21, 1856, Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, made his bitter speech in the Senate on what he termed "The Crime Against Kansas," and on the next day Preston H. Brooks, of South Carolina, struck Sumner over the head with his cane, knocking him senseless to the floor. Sumner's condition after this stroke aroused the sympathy and indignation of the whole North, and Brooks, after an unsuccessful attempt to expel him from the House, which was at the time anti-slavery, resigned his seat and applied to his people for vindication, which they gave him almost unanimously, there being only six votes against him. This episode became of national importance as a controlling element in the politics of the day. In the eyes of the extremists of the North, Brooks' assault embodied the ruffian spirit of pro-slaveryism and Sumner's speech, in the eyes of the South, embodied the spirit of the abolitionists, who had, it was claimed, no regard for the rights of slaveholders. During this period a new impetus was given to the sale of "Uncle Tom's Cabin," hundreds of thousands of copies of which were bought and eagerly read. The advance in the spirit of the pro-slavery propaganda was shown by resolutions passed by a convention of southern men held at Savannah, Ga., December 12, 1856, and at another at Vicksburg in 1859, asking for the repeal of the law interdicting the foreign slave trade. During the years 1856-60 many negroes

from Africa were smuggled into Southern ports and sold there into slavery.

The Dred Scott Case.

March 6, 1857, is also an epoch marker. On that day the Dred Scott Case, the most celebrated in the annals of this country, made Dred Scott, a Missouri negro, the most notorious, if not the most illustrious, man of his age. Since March 6, 1857, his name has been spoken and printed millions of times. The Court, through Chief Justice Taney, in that case, held: 1st. The right of property in a slave is distinctly and expressly affirmed in the Constitution. 2nd. As the Constitution makes no distinction between slave property and other property, "no tribunal acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be legislative, executive or judicial, has a right to draw such distinctions or deny to it" the protection of the Government. 3rd. No negro, whether free or slave, could become a citizen of the United States without their consent. 4th. For a hundred years before the adoption of the Constitution the people held that negroes had no rights which they (the whites) were bound to respect. 5th. That neither Congress nor a Territorial Legislature had the power to exclude slavery from the Territories, and consequently the Missouri Compromise Line was unconstitutional and void. McLean and Curtis, two of the Justices, filed able dissenting opinions, taking issue with the Chief Justice on all points. The decision caused jubilation and delight in the South. Now there could be no question but that all the Territories were alike open to the slaveholders with the assurance of protection for slave property there. The North, on the other hand, could see nothing in this decision but added proof of the determination of the slaveholders to nationalize slavery, reversing, as it did, the policy inaugurated by Jefferson in 1784, and consummated by the ordinance of 1787, and the compromise measures of 1820 and 1850, and the Republican party, the anti-slavery party, lately organized, appealed from the Supreme Court to the people on the momentous questions

involved in the Dred Scott case. Here was presented a new phase of an old conflict. The South maintained that this appeal was simply a new manifestation, in concrete form, of the higher law doctrine; it was revolutionary and subversive of all government. On this appeal in the Dred Scott case, the anti-slavery advocates argued that it was only a step from the principles of this decision to the nationalization of what they regarded as the "crime of crimes" as "the sum of all villainies." It was plain to them that if slaves were mere chattels, things, like horses or cattle, and the Constitution of the United States threw its protecting arm around the institution of slavery in the Territories, the same Constitution protected slavery in all the States, against State Constitutions or State laws, thus nationalizing that institution. This seemed logical. They further contended that while the Constitution recognized the existence of slavery, it did not establish it...that slavery was against the world spirit and especially against the spirit of American institutions, and that Congress had the power and ought to exercise the power to prevent the extension of such an institution into the Territories under its immediate control. Their battle cry became "No more slave States anywhere North or South." Thomas H. Benton, in September, 1857, published, in Washington, "An Examination of the Dred Scott Decision" in which he took the ground that it was wrong on every point, considered judicially or historically.

Missouri Takes a Hand Again.

February 16, 1857, the Missouri Legislature declared by a joint resolution by a vote in the House of 107 to 12, 13 not voting, and in the Senate by a vote of 25 to 4, 4 not voting, "that the emancipation of slaves held as property in this State would be impracticable, inexpedient, impolitic, unwise and unjust and should be discountenanced by the people of the State."

The Battle of the Constitution.

The Kansas Legislature, elected March 30, 1855, enacted an extreme pro-slavery code, even making it a felony to deny by word or in print that a man could not hold slaves in Kansas, and in 1857 it called a Constitutional Convention which adopted a pro-slavery constitution, known as "The LeCompton Constitution," which was presented in the winter of 1858, and Congress was asked to admit Kansas under it as a slave State. Then came the battle of the constitutions, LeCompton against Topeka. The LeCompton Constitution proved to be the rock on which the Democratic party split. The Buchanan administration advocated the admission of Kansas under that Constitution, while Douglas and his followers took strong grounds against it, arguing that it was very plain that that Constitution did not reflect the will of the people of that Territory. The contest became one mainly between the administration and the Douglasites, as the Democratic party, at that time, controlled both Houses of Congress. There is very little question that Douglas decided the fate of Kansas. If he had joined the administration forces, the LeCompton Constitution would probably have been adopted, and the whole course of Kansas-Missouri history changed. This schism in the Democratic party became permanent, and projected itself into the presidential campaign of 1860, and really determined its result. The outcome of the whole matter was the submission of the LeCompton Constitution to a vote of the people of Kansas with the promise of protection against outsiders, and the assurance of a fair election. August 2, 1858, the people rejected it by a vote of 11,300 to 1,788. This really ended the contest there. That vote made it plain that Kansas was to come in as a free State.

Illinois Becomes the Battlefield.**Lincoln in the Limelight.**

A crisis was plainly in view and events of portentous importance, it was seen, would soon transpire, and the man to meet that crisis and control those events emerged from

comparative obscurity. This man was Abraham Lincoln. The great debate between him and Douglas in Illinois took place in 1858, and the whole country listened. In that debate and in the next two years, this man, seeing more clearly than any other statesman of that period, the issues that ought to be made, brought order out of chaos. The course of the free State men of Kansas in refusing to recognize the Legislature elected March 30, 1855, as they claimed, by Missourians, as legal, or to obey the government it set up, which course was endorsed by the anti-slavery forces in Congress and in the country, and the proclamation of the higher law doctrine by such men as Seward and Sumner, and the war made on the Fugitive Slave Law, had made the attitude of the Republican party one of disorder and disobedience to law, and had made the Democratic the law and order party. Mr. Lincoln saw clearly that if this attitude of the two parties was maintained, nothing but defeat could come to the party advocating disobedience to and defiance of the law; and here is where he showed wisdom above that of his contemporary statesmen. He saw that the fight, the final one, between slavery and freedom, was on. The vast step on the slavery question from Thomas Jefferson to Jefferson Davis, plainly portended the trend of slavery agitation. The aggressions of the slave power, as it was called, must cease. All of the territory of the United States must be dedicated to freedom. No more slave States must be admitted, but all this must be done legally and in order. Mr. Lincoln pointed the way. He ignored the higher law doctrine entirely, asserted that the slaveholders were entitled to a fair fugitive slave law, and that Congress had no power to interfere with slavery in the States where it existed. This turned all the abolitionists against him, but he persisted. He asserted that the fathers deemed slavery an evil to be dealt with as such, and that we must come back to that thought. The South claimed a divine sanction for slavery, making it right, and a constitutional sanction, making it legal. He said it was "no just function of the Government to prohibit what is not wrong," that if "slavery

is right, ordained by the Almighty, on one side of a line..... then it is positively wrong to harass and bedevil the owners of it with constitutions and laws and prohibitions of it on the other side of the line." "We must have," he says, "a national policy as to slavery which deals with it as being wrong." If slavery is right it can logically go everywhere; if it is wrong it ought finally to disappear everywhere. The slaveholders deemed slavery right. The North, if it was to remain consistent, must take the ground that slavery is wrong. This would make the issue between slavery and freedom irrepressible, and that conflict would go on until freedom conquered slavery or was conquered by it. This country could not remain half slave and half free; that a house divided against itself could not stand. He did not expect the country to become all slave, but he did hope and expect, as our fathers had hoped and expected, that slavery would in time be put in such shape that the people would rest assured it would finally disappear, and we would become a homogeneous people. All of this must be done, Mr. Lincoln said, under the forms of law. Even in his criticism of the Dred Scott decision, and his appeal to the people from that decision, he took no revolutionary stand. The Supreme Court, he said, had in the past reversed its own decisions and it could do so again. He appealed to the people because he claimed the people could unmake and remake both the Court and the Constitution. Many of that time thought, as many think now, that Mr. Lincoln, at this point, got on very thin ice. But he was right, and in this his democracy touched elbows with the democracy of Jefferson and Jackson, though it stood in deadly conflict with that of the extreme Southern Democrats of that day. The history of the Supreme Court proves that Mr. Lincoln had the right to make that appeal. Federalist judges wrote Federalist doctrines permanently in our institutions. Democratic judges conformed their views to the Democratic pro-slavery construction of the Constitution, and Republican judges have engrafted Republican principles in the laws of the land. Besides that, the Democratic party, for thirty

years prior to 1860, had made a successful appeal to the people from the decisions of the Supreme Court on the power of Congress to establish a National Bank; and even as late as 1896 and 1900, the Democratic party in its platform appealed from the Supreme Court on the bank and income tax questions.

The law will grow under our form of government, and I maintain that the people have a right, and the power, too, to make that growth conform to their conceptions of government. There is no danger in this principle, either. If England, without a written constitution, has evolved in the ages such splendid government as she has, there can come no possible danger to us from a government evolved by the people under a written constitution in an orderly and regular way.

Mr. Lincoln's outline of the issues, so plain and explicit, struck a responsive cord in the Northern heart. Is slavery right? If so, protect it. Is it wrong? If so, treat it as all other wrongs are treated, so as to get rid of it peaceably as soon as possible. On the other hand, the South denounced Mr. Lincoln's position in unmeasured terms, and December 15, 1859, the Missouri Legislature, by joint resolutions, joined the South in such denunciation.

Events moved rapidly to make the issue between slavery as right, having Divine sanction, and slavery as wrong, to be dealt with as such, sharper and more distinct.

Helper's Impending Crisis.

In 1859, Helper, a North Carolinian, published "The Impending Crisis." Mrs. Stowe had appealed to the moral and religious forces of the country against slavery, while Helper appealed mainly to the non-slaveholders of the South against that institution, presenting the economic side of the slave question. The book was full of statistics, showing that slavery was a fatal injury to the South and to free labor. It was endorsed by John Sherman and other leading anti-slavery men, and it was printed and distributed in the

North as a campaign document in 1860. This book angered the South to a greater extent than "Uncle Tom's Cabin," because it struck nearer home. It appealed to the non-slaveholders of the South, and the slaveholders realized that if ever the non-slaveholders of their section concluded slavery was, in an economic way, an injury to them, slavery was doomed in the States, for out of a white population in the South in 1850 of about 6,000,000, 4,250,000 were non-slaveholders, and, of course, if united, could control the remainder, less than 2,000,000. Helper and all his endorsers were furiously denounced everywhere in the South.

John Brown.

In the same year, 1859, John Brown made his celebrated raid at Harper's Ferry, Va., and he was captured and hung. His execution was witnessed by 2,000 people, among them being Governor Wise of Virginia, Wilkes Booth and Robert E. Lee. The poets of the North apotheosized John Brown as the very incarnation of the spirit of freedom and of the higher law doctrine, that if it be right to enslave men and women by force, it is not only right, but a duty to make them free by force, and in less than five years the soldiers of the Union army and the people, too, were singing "John Brown's body lies mouldering in the grave, but his soul goes marching on."

In the South John Brown was denounced as a murderer and traitor, and the people there viewed his act as only another proof of the lawlessness of abolition fanaticism.

The Higher Law.

As has been stated, Mrs. Stowe in "Uncle Tom's Cabin" made heroes and heroines of the men and women who defied the Fugitive Slave Law, and aided slaves to escape from bondage by means of the underground railroad to Canada. A slave catcher came to be detested in the North, as much as a slave-kidnapper was in the South. Many fugitive slave cases came before the courts, every one creating

intense excitement. One, however, as portraying in a peculiar way the prevailing feeling in the North, may be specially mentioned.

At Oberlin, Ohio, a fugitive slave was turned over to the owner or his agent and Simon Bushnell and about thirty others rescued him September 13, 1858. The rescuers were indicted, and in April, 1859, Bushnell was tried and convicted in Cleveland, and made to pay a fine of \$600.00, and was sent to jail for sixty days. The people let the law take its course, but when Bushnell had served out his jail sentence they made his return to Oberlin, July 11th, a triumphant march, where an immense crowd was gathered to welcome him home. He made a speech saying that he had done right, had paid the penalty of the law for it, and he was ready to do the same thing again when opportunity offered, whereat a great shout of approval rent the air. The whole affair from its inception to its close had lasted about ten months. The whole North was aroused. The press, platform and pulpit resounded with sympathy for Bushnell, and with a full endorsement of his course and of his determination to obey his conscience rather than the law. The people became conscious of the deeper conflict underlying and causing the throes of the time. Both parties saw the issue in its full bearing. The conflict was irrepressible indeed and the crisis was seen to be surely approaching.

Bushnell's case revealed a new phase of the higher law doctrine, presenting the difference between submission to law and disobedience to law. He had disobeyed the Fugitive Slave Law, but he submitted to the penalty it imposed. There was no effort on the part of the people to rescue him. They also submitted to the law, but when he emerged from his prison sentence, they tumultuously put upon his brow the martyr's crown.

The fugitive slave cases, "Uncle Tom's Cabin," Helper's "The Impending Crisis" and the general trend of the slavery agitation, brought the South to realize that a defense of slavery had to be made before the bar of the American people. Mr. E. N. Elliott of Mississippi undertook this task,

and January 1, 1860, published a book called "Cotton is King." This work contained many articles by the ablest pro-slavery writers of the country. It undertook to show that African slavery, as it existed in the United States, was economically and morally right, that it had the Divine sanction in the Bible, that it was a blessing to the whites and slaves alike, and that the effort of the anti-slavery people of the North to abolish it was a crime, and it must be confessed that it left nothing on that side to be said. This book was in line with the thought of all the pro-slavery statesmen of the day; and they cannot be regarded as of a low order intellectually, though they lacked the imagination to transmit a knowledge of the past into the comprehensions of the future. They clearly comprehended the issue Mr. Lincoln had made between slavery as right and slavery as wrong, and feeling that they must stand by the rightfulness of slavery or go down, inspired "Cotton is King," which, in a very able way, undertook to show that slavery was right. But the appeal was against the moral sense of the world and of the age, and from the start they fought a losing fight. "Cotton is King," however, had the effect to make the issue clearer and sharper, and when the final test came in November, 1860, between the united forces opposed to slavery as wrong, and the warring, discordant factions of the opposing forces, Mr. Lincoln, representing the former was elected President.

Six years of intense and angry agitation, accompanied by lawlessness and bloodshed, had heated the iron hot, and South Carolina, taking Mr. Lincoln at his word that the purpose of his party was to nationalize freedom, struck while the iron was hot, and ten of her Southern sisters, some willingly, some reluctantly, followed her lead, and at half past four on the morning of April 12, 1861, the bomb was fired on Ft. Sumpter and the flag, and called the nation to arms, and the maintainance of the Union was submitted to the arbitrament of the sword.

The conservative, compromising forces of the border States stood aghast at war, but the extremists of both sides

stood firm, the South because it felt sure of separation and independence, the North, because, while it hoped to perpetuate the Union, it would, in case of final separation, be relieved from responsibility for slavery and as a foreign nation it would have a free hand, untrammelled by laws or constitutions, in its war on that institution. It was a battle of giants, and after four years of the bloodiest war of modern times, the dogma of secession expired, and four millions of slaves were bidden to go free in the agony of the Nation. The slaves are free, but after forty years of freedom for them, the race question still abides, and God forbid that we, by our other fatal mistakes, should have to settle that question too in another agony of the Nation, bloodier and fiercer, probably, than the first.

But the race problem is one phase of the slavery question. Racial prejudice is not local but earthwide and in its presence reason is dumb, and the race issue is one that probably statesmen cannot settle, but must be ground out in Time's mills in the tears and anguish of the people. Those, that won't reason, must suffer.

What a frightful mistake the statesmen of Missouri made in 1820 in not adopting the gradual emancipation scheme then proposed, and insisting on excepting this State from the operation of the Missouri Compromise Line. I am not much given to speculation on "what might have been," but I hope you will pardon me for saying a word or two on what, it is now apparent to all, would have happened if Missouri had come into the Union in 1820 as a free State. If our State had been made a free State by the terms of her admission into the Union she would have escaped the woes unnumbered which the curse of slavery in after years brought on her; and then what another fatal mistake the Missouri statesmen made in 1854, when they voted unanimously, with the exception of Benton in the House, for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise Line. If the mistakes of 1820 and 1854 had not been made, our beloved State would not now have to record in sorrow and in tears the scenes enacted at Camp Jackson, or Springfield, or Osceola,

or Lone Jack, or Palmyra, or Kirksville, or Centralia, or recount the devastations and loss of life along the trail of Price and his army from Pittman's Ferry by way of Pilot Knob, Union, Boonville, Westport and along the Missouri-Kansas line south, and the invasion by Missourians of Kansas Territory to make it a slave State, the tarring and feathering of free State men, the sack of Lawrence, May 21, 1856, the bloody raid of old John Brown in the neighborhood of Dutch Ferry's Crossing, May 24, 1856, the raids of Jennison and Montgomery along the Missouri-Kansas border, and the tragedy of the Marais des Cygnes, by all of which the Missourians acquired the name of "Border Ruffians," and Kansans that of "Jayhawkers;" the massacre of Lawrence in 1863 under Quantrell and the depopulation of Bates, Cass and Jackson counties by "Order No. 11" would not have occurred. In that case Missouri would have been in firm and friendly league with Kansas, and together they would have stood shoulder to shoulder in defense of the Union. But these mistakes were made and our western neighbor emerged from a ten years' contest as "Bloody Kansas," and Missouri's soil was drenched in fraternal blood, and at the end of the conflict she found her beautiful hills and plains almost one vast desolation, and the passions of her people wrought up by the bloody strife to white heat. The wounds growing out of these mistakes of our leaders in 1820 and 1854 have been substantially healed, but they bring up many bitter memories yet. The Missouri Compromise Line has long since vanished, but no man can understand American history, and especially Missouri history, without fully understanding the history of the rise and fall of that line. The conflicts growing out of its establishment in the first place, and its abolition in the second place, tinge our whole history. Yes, they have controlled the trend and the outcome of our whole history, but the abolition and not the establishment of that line marked the most portentous epoch in our history.

It is appropriate that I should state, en passant, that an injustice was done both Kansas and Missouri in calling

the citizens of the former indiscriminately "Jayhawkers," and the citizens of the latter "Border Ruffians," for but a few comparatively of the Kansans were "Jayhawkers" and only a small number of the Missourians were "Border Ruffians."

Permit me to suggest that the Kansas struggle and our attitude in the Civil War affected us in one direction, the injurious consequences of which are probably irreparable; that is, owing to the conduct of the Missourians in interfering with the emigration of free State men through our border, the emigrants from the North were diverted from us through Iowa and Nebraska, and I feel sure that if Missouri had been what was termed a true, loyal State during the war, the first Pacific railroad would have traversed our territory instead of that of Iowa, and St. Louis would at once have been the halfway station between the oceans. Prior to the Kansas struggle and the Civil War everything pointed to this result. The Santa Fe and Oregon trails, and the Overland Mail Route to California began in our borders. A convention of delegates from fifteen States held at St. Louis, October 15-17, 1849, recommended a Central Pacific railroad, and this was the dream of Benton when in his speech at that convention he uttered those immortal words, "There is the east, there is the road to India." But while Missourians were engaged in a bloody, internecine strife for the mastery, marching and countermarching her hostile armies over her hills and across her valleys, desolating the homes of the people and bringing pangs of distress to numberless women and children, and death to its best citizens, Chicago seized the prize, and she holds it today. But will Chicago always hold the prize? St. Louis ought to be the commercial metropolis of the great Mississippi basin. Her geographical position entitles her to it, and it was only wrested from her at a time when Missouri lay bleeding at the feet of the War God. Is it too late for St. Louis now to regain what she lost by the mistakes of 1820 and 1854? I cannot answer but I hope.

Conclusion.

What was the result of the fierce controversy, so far as the chief Missouri participants in it, Benton and Atchison, were concerned? Atchison, though the leader of the pro-slavery party, failed to succeed himself in the Senate in 1855-56, and was retired to private life. He died, and the public has almost forgotten him. On the other hand, Benton died April 10, 1858, a political outcast, but in 1895 the Missouri Legislature appropriated money to place life size marble statues of Benton and his pupil and admirer, Francis P. Blair, in Statuary Hall in the Capitol, at Washington, under the Act of Congress, authorizing each State to place in that Hall marble or bronze statues of two of its deceased distinguished citizens, whom it might deem worthy of national commemoration on account of civil or military services. Their statues were placed in that Hall, and by resolution February 4, 1899, they were accepted by Congress, and they were formally accepted by the House on the same day and by the Senate May 19, 1900, by appropriate resolutions and addresses. Thus the State, whose politicians had infused gall and wormwood in the last eight years of Benton's life, forty years after he had "gone to the bourne, whence no traveler returns," rendered him the greatest honor in its power. This posthumous homage, vividly reminds us of that strange freak in our nature that impels us, often, to ostracize a man while he lives and apotheosize him after he is dead.

JOHN L. THOMAS.

BRYANT'S STATION AND ITS FOUNDER WILLIAM BRYANT.

The pioneer Kentucky fort, so long and so widely known in history, in public records, in Court trials and in Court decisions as Bryant's Station, was built in the month of April, 1779. The founder of Bryant's Station and the man from whom it derived its name was William Bryant.

By the evening fireside as a boy, the writer hereof early grew familiar with the history of the station and its founder. It was perhaps but natural that he should listen with delight to the thrilling story regarding the place, because of the fact that his great grandfather was the founder of this farfamed and historic fort. Whatever, therefore, is herein stated, is based not alone upon history, but also upon well established tradition.

The Memorial Proceedings.

Memorial proceedings were held upon the site of this vanished fort in 1896, to do honor to the memory of the pioneer women who, when the station was besieged by the Indians in the month of August, 1782, left the protecting walls of the fort, marched down to the spring around which lay four hundred and fifty savage foes concealed in the weeds and cane, and obtained a sufficient supply of water to enable the men within the fort to withstand the siege of the Indian foe. Articles were contributed by several writers, all of which were prepared for publication by Col. Reuben T. Durrett, of Louisville, President of the Filson Club, and the volume containing these articles is known as Filson Club Publication No. 12.

An account of William Bryant should have occupied a place in this publication. The omission was perhaps due to a lack of definite information regarding him, upon the part of

those who participated in the memorial proceedings. And it was not until some time afterward that descendants of William Bryant, residing in other States, learned of the memorial proceedings.

Col. Durrett, in the address which he delivered gave to the public for the first time, the names of several women and girls who went to the spring for water, thus rescuing after many years their names from undeserved neglect. And to which may now be added the name of Rachel Bryant, wife of William Bryant, the founder and chief defender of the station.

And it is now deemed proper and pertinent that the founder of Bryant's Station, should be specifically pointed out and identified. For while the historians generally have given the name of William Bryant as the founder of the station, there have not been wanting statements on the part of some writers, which, whether intended to be or not, have nevertheless been very misleading, not only to other writers, but also to those interested in collecting and preserving material of an historic character concerning Bryant's Station and its founder.

The time has arrived, however, when before departing further from well established historic facts, the name of the founder of Bryant's Station should be delivered from error and confusion, and placed in its proper light in history free of all misleading statements. The record of such a man is deemed worthy of preservation. Nor is it altogether unimportant that our histories should be free from error and confusion, in order that the reader may with confidence rely upon it that all statements rest upon the foundation stones of fact.

While the history of Bryant's Station, its siege by the Indians in August, 1782, the heroic act of its women in going to the spring for water, and the disastrous battle of the Blue Licks which followed hard upon these other events spreading death and sorrow in its wake, have been told again and again, yet how few there are who know anything of the founder of the station aside from his mere name.

The founder of Bryant's Station has not been sufficiently identified by our historians; or rather, statements have been introduced concerning him, which have been not only inaccu-

rate, but positively misleading, and having the effect only of confusing the reader. No effort has been made so far as I am aware to correct these errors, although it has long been known that they exist, and so far as I am aware no attempt has been made to give to the public a complete and accurate account of the founder of Bryant's Station, by those having knowledge of the facts. And it is with the hope that the same will find some interested readers, and that the future historian will know whereof he speaks when he refers to the founder of Bryant's Station that his narrative has been written.

With reference to the speculation in which some parties have indulged in recent years, induced by some of the misleading statements above referred to, regarding the name of the station, if the reader desires to investigate for himself upon this point, he is respectfully referred to Filson Club Publication No. 12, and particularly to the unbiased statement of facts as therein set forth by Col. Durrett. If further evidence were wanting, however, than that contained in the above named publication, it may be found in two decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, involving title to lands in the neighborhood of Bryant's Station, one rendered in 1816, (1) the other in 1834. (2)

From the first named decision I beg to quote as follows:

"Bryant's Station is a fixed place of public notoriety. It is on the great road leading from Lexington to Limestone on the Ohio, which road crosses the dividing ridge between the waters of Elkhorn and Licking, which is the ridge mentioned in Masterson's entry."

I quote another sentence peculiarly applicable in this connection:

"Perplexity and confusion may be introduced, but an object can not be rendered more certain than by bestowing on it its particular and appropriate name, if that name be one of general notoriety."

1. See *Maston v. Hord*, U. S. Reports, (Wheaton), Vol. 1, page 130.

2. *Garnett v. Jenkins*, U. S. Rep. (8 Peters), p. 72.

In the Appendix to Vol. 1, page 491, I find also the following language:

"Noteriety is either absolute or relative. Absolute, as where the object is known so generally, that according to the usual courtesies and intercourse among men, the presumption is irresistible that anyone using ordinary inquiry might have been conducted to the place, as Lexington, Bryant's Station, the Lower Blue Licks, etc. Relative, as where the particular object is not actually known but is ascertainable by reasonable diligence, as one mile east of the lower Blue Licks, etc."

From this decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, it must be apparent to the least discriminating mind that Bryant's Station, was known to be and was recognized as being the particular and appropriate name of the station. How could the place have been rendered more certain, than by bestowing on it its particular and appropriate name? And its particular and appropriate name being Bryant's Station, the particular and appropriate name of its founder could not have been other than Bryant.

In the trial of the cause decided in 1834, the testimony of about twenty-five witnesses was introduced in evidence, some of whom had visited the North fork of the Elkhorn before Bryant's Station was built, and some of whom had resided at the station or in its vicinity thereafter, and the name of the station without exception is given as Bryant's. Without going into detail, I quote from the evidence of two of the witnesses. Patrick Jordon relates that in the year 1780:

"Bryant's Station was a place of general noteriety, and he presumes it is twenty-five or thirty miles above Lecompt's Run."

John Ficklin states that he has been acquainted with Bryant's Station and North Elkhorn ever since 1781:

"Both Bryant's Station and North Elkhorn were places of great noteriety at that time."

From the foregoing it will be seen that Bryant's Station was a place widely known, and it was everywhere recognized that the name of the place was without question Bryant's Station, and in all records of a public or official nature and in all

historical documents, unaffected by error, it was so called. It can easily be understood how, in the miscellaneous correspondence of the day, or in cases wherein the parties in interest may have affected the name, "perplexity and confusion" might be introduced, but such errors can not destroy the unimpeachable record, which must ever afford the best and most credible evidence as to the correct name.

But since it is conceded by all, (3) that the name of the place was Bryant's Station, and since it is likewise conceded that the name of the parties mentioned in Bradford's Notes, and by some other persons, was not Bryant, and the facts conclusively show that they did not use this name, nor were they known by the name of Bryant, all else at once becomes simplified, and errors of every nature may therefore be justly disregarded. And I shall now state such facts regarding the founder of this pioneer fort, whose name was Bryant, as may be deemed pertinent, and shall take no liberties either with names or facts, a practice which should commend itself to every one writing upon historical subjects.

William Bryant.

Dr. Percy Bryant, of Buffalo, N. Y., has told us that "The name Bryant can be traced back to Sir Guy De Briant, who lived in the time of Edward III, and whose descendants had their seat at the castle of Hereford in the marches of Wales. Arms: The field is Or, three piles meeting near in the base of the Escutcheon, Azure. No connection has been established between this family and the first of the name who came to America with the early settlers of Plymouth Colony, but this will probably be accomplished when the effort is made." (4)

According to well established tradition, William Bryant, of Bryant's Station, accompanied by a brother named Benjamin Bryant, came from Wales to the shores of the New World

3. Filson Club Pub. No. 12, page 21, note (Durrett).

Filson Club Pub. No. 12, page 72, note (Ranck).

4. New Eng. Hist. & Genealogical Index, Vol. XLVIII, page 46.

in 1764, while they were young men. William Bryant settled in North Carolina in the region of the upper Yadkin river, while his brother chose Virginia for his adopted state. In this region William Bryant lived for several years, married and acquired property, and here he became acquainted with the Boones, Bryans, Wilcoxes, Callaways and other pioneer families in that section of the country. Being near the same age as Daniel Boone, the two became warm friends, and the friendship thus begun on the frontier of North Carolina, continued throughout the remainder of their lives.

Boone and Bryant Visit Kentucky.

Some time prior to the year 1775, two men wandering out from the settlements on the Yadkin River in North Carolina, penetrated the region of Kentucky as far as the North fork Elkhorn Creek. Here they made a camp, hunted and explored the country for several weeks, then breaking up their camp returned to the settlements on the Yadkin. They were Daniel Boone and William Bryant. Both were destined to become historic characters on account of their connection with the early settlements of Kentucky. Boone on account of his many daring deeds and thrilling adventures, has been justly celebrated by the historians of the border. While it did not fall to the lot of William Bryant to particularly engage the pen of the historian, and while his life was not so filled with adventure as was that of Boone, nevertheless he was a conspicuous actor in several important events and had a wide and varied experience, and his name is inseparably linked with the early settlement of Kentucky and Missouri, and his name is to be found upon the pages of history in the States named.

During the progress of the Revolutionary War, William Bryant joined the Continental forces and served for a time in the War for Independence. And while serving as such soldier he was captured by the British, and was placed on board a prison ship in Charleston harbor. One night he dropped silently into the waters of the harbor, swam ashore and returned to the American lines in safety. It is said that his brother

united his fortunes with the Tories, and I have no further account of him or of his descendants, if he had any.

Early in the year 1779, William Bryant led a party of emigrants into the wilderness of Kentucky for the purpose of securing land under the law of Virginia which opened Kentucky to settlement. Stopping at Boonesborough on the way they obtained some needed supplies, and then continued their journey, halting at length at a point about five miles northeast of Lexington, where they erected and fortified a number of cabins, and the place was from that time forth known as Bryant's Station, in honor of the leader of the party; it being the usual custom in the early days of Kentucky, to name the stations after their most conspicuous man. And as Harrodsborough and Boonesborough, had derived their names from their respective founders James Harrod and Daniel Boone, so also Bryant's Station derived its name from its founder, William Bryant.

Col. Cave Johnson in his Autobiography (5) states that in 1779, while he and Wm. Tomlinson were on their way from Virginia to Kentucky, they met on the Cumberland River this party of emigrants. He and Tomlinson joined the emigrant party and for greater safety and convenience journeyed with them to the North fork of Elkhorn Creek, and assisted in building the first cabins of Bryant's Station.

I have already stated that William Bryant was a soldier of the Revolutionary War. I have been unable to learn from the records at Washington, D. C., that he ever applied for or was granted a pension for such services. From the records of soldiers who served in the war, however, at Raleigh, N. C., I have found his record of service. Following is an extract from a letter from the Secretary of State of the State of North Carolina, addressed to the writer hereof, dated Oct. 9, 1906:

"Replying to your letter of recent date, I beg to say that I find in the Colonial Records copied from the records (of soldiers who served in the Revolutionary War) in Philadelphia, the following: Wm. Bryant, Pt. Blounts Company; date of

5. Autobiography of Cave Johnson MS. in possession of Col. R. T. Durrett, Louisville.

commission or enlistment, 26 Apr. '78; period of service 2 1-4 years; omd. in 1779."

From the foregoing it will be seen that to April, 1779, William Bryant had served for practically a year in the Revolutionary War, his services being omitted in 1779, while he was in Kentucky. And as he served all told two and one-fourth years, it will be seen that after having been in Kentucky for a year, he then returned to North Carolina, where he served an additional one and a fourth years in the War.

At the close of the War he returned to Kentucky with his wife to remain permanently. The reason for his return to North Carolina is accounted for from the following facts:

The land commissioners who held their Court at Bryant's Station in 1780 to adjust settlers' and improvers' rights to lands, found that the title to the land on which the station was built belonged to another (Col. Wm. Preston), and William Bryant, much to his regret no doubt, was compelled to relinquish the land upon which he had settled, and which he had previously explored in company with Boone; and on the 20th of May, 1780, he entered other land in the usual way.

Hunting Expedition of May, 1780.

It was about this time also, that an event occurred which perhaps furnishes the real reason why Wm. Bryant returned to North Carolina; for in truth the event referred to well nigh caused the abandonment of Bryant's Station. From the first, the Indians had constantly harassed the settlers, committing all manner of depredations. No one could go outside the walls of the fort without great risk of being fired upon by the skulking foe, and the cattle, hogs and other stock of the settlers were almost daily being butchered or stolen from them by the Indians. So troublesome and daring had they become that, in order to procure meat for the station, which was obtained by hunting, for the woods abounded with game, the settlers were compelled to hunt in parties of sufficient number to be able to defend themselves against any assault which might be made by the Indians.

One afternoon during the latter part of May 1780, (6) twelve mounted men left the fort on a hunting expedition down Elkhorn Creek, led by William Bryant. When they arrived in the hunting woods near where Georgetown now stands, they determined in order to cover as wide a scope of country as possible, to divide themselves into three parties. (7) One of these parties was under the immediate direction of William Bryant; another of the parties appears to have been acting under the direction of James Hogan. It does not definitely appear who led the third party. Hogan's party was to cross the Elkhorn and range down the North side, while the other two parties were to range down the South side, flanking out as much as possible, but the three parties were to meet at night at the mouth of Cane Run of North Elkhorn, and encamp together during the night. William Bryant and his men arrived safely at the place agreed upon. The other parties however were less fortunate. Hogan's party having traveled but a short distance after crossing the Elkhorn, heard a loud voice in their rear calling upon them to halt. Hastily looking back, they found that they were being pursued by a war party of Indians, and not being in condition to give battle, being uncertain as to the number of the enemy, they immediately began endeavoring to effect an escape, being closely pursued by the Indians. They finally outdistanced the savages, however, recrossed the Elkhorn near sundown, and returned to Bryant's Station. It appears that the third party of hunters also, soon after separating from the other parties were set upon by a party of Indians some twelve or fourteen in number, and this party also retreated, and succeeded in getting off without being fired upon, and they, too, retraced their steps to Bryant's Station.

On the following morning, Hogan now re-enforced by twelve or fifteen men, left the fort before daylight and went in search of William Bryant and his men. They traveled

6. Autobiography of Cave Johnson, MS.

7. Several writers have made it appear that the hunters were divided into but two parties. This and other errors appear to have originated in Bradford's Notes.

down the Elkhorn in the direction of the mouth of Cane Run, and when within a mile or so of the place, they heard the report of several guns in quick succession. Concluding that Bryant and his men were either engaged in a battle with the Indians, or had fallen upon a herd of buffaloes, Hogan and his men hastened forward to lend their aid in either event. They arrived too late, however, to avert disaster. The Indians who had on the previous day captured a pack horse which had been abandoned by Hogan and his men in their flight, had made use of this animal to draw William Bryant into an ambuscade.

William Bryant and his men who had been hunting on the previous day, soon after starting out on the morning following to renew the chase, heard the sound of a bell on the pack horse, which they immediately recognized. Not knowing what this circumstance meant, and not understanding why the other parties had not joined him the night before as agreed, Bryant now directed his three companions to remain where they were, while he should cross an intervening creek to the horse and ascertain what this circumstance meant. He had approached within a short distance of the animal, when suddenly and without warning, he was fired upon by a party of Indians in a canebrake near by and was severely wounded. Although his wounds were exceedingly painful and severe, he immediately set spurs to his horse, succeeded in eluding the Indians and returned to Bryant's Station where he arrived early in the day. (8)

Hogan and his men soon arrived upon the scene, encountered the Indians and a battle ensued, lasting some thirty minutes. They at length compelled the Indians to retreat, however, with the loss of one Indian killed and scalped, and several others wounded who effected their escape. Hogan and his men had fared but little better; for upon returning from the pursuit of the Indians, they found one of their own number where he had fallen, mortally wounded. He was taken on to the station where he expired soon afterward. Four others were also wounded, though none mortally.

Some writers have made it appear that William Bryant was killed in this hunting expedition. One of them, referring to the station at the date of its siege by the Indians, says: (9)

"There were at that time but few families occupying the station, William Bryant, its founder, and one in whose judgment, skill and courage, many confidently reposed for security from savage enormity, had been unfortunately discovered by some Indians near the mouth of Cane Run, and killed. His death caused most of those who had come to that place from North Carolina, to forsake the station, and return to their own country."

The statement that William Bryant was killed in this hunting expedition, is absolutely incorrect and without foundation in fact. As we have already seen, he was severely wounded, but his injuries at the hands of the Indians were not fatal. It was doubtless true, however, that his wounds, which rendered him unfit for service during the summer of 1780, together with the loss of the land on which the station was built, caused him to return to North Carolina, and it is not unreasonable to suppose that many of the more timid settlers felt justified in abandoning the place when deprived of the services of their chief defender.

The error as to his having been killed, no doubt had its origin in a series of articles which appeared in the Kentucky Gazette in 1826, (10) and subsequent years, nearly fifty years after the event occurred, and several years after William Bryant had removed from the State of Kentucky. The articles referred to are not more accurate than many other newspaper articles, published under similar circumstances. (11)

It would appear that the object sought by Bradford in his account of Bryant's Station and the hunting expedition of May, 1780, was not attained. For instead of converting the name of the place, which was evidently his purpose, so thor-

9. *Chronicles of Border Warfare*, by Withers, (New Edition) p. 348.

10. *Bradford's Notes*.

11. In *Filson Club Pub. No. 12*, Mr. G. W. Ranck merely reiterates, with certain material alterations, Bradford's statements.

oughly was it established in history and in all public records that the name of the place was Bryant's Station, and so well was it understood that the name of its founder was William Bryant, subsequent writers knew as a matter of course that he meant Bryant's Station, and they accordingly continued to so call it. And they likewise naturally supposed that the name of the parties mentioned by him must be, therefore, "Bryant also," and they erroneously called them Bryant. And by a similar parity of reasoning, they naturally supposed that the party particularly referred to by him, who had been killed by the Indians, and whose name was similar to that of William Bryant, was William Bryant, and being thus unwittingly misled they gave to the public the error that William Bryant, the founder of Bryant's Station had been killed by the Indians while on a hunting expedition. (12)

The man who received his mortal wounds in the battle between Hogan's men and the Indians was probably a brother-in-law of Daniel Boone (13) and who had entered land in the vicinity of Bryant's Station at an early day.

If Bradford had not disregarded certain well established historic facts; if he had stated all the facts relative to the founding of Bryant's Station, or if his account of the hunting expedition had contained a correct statement of the facts, there would indeed have been small ground upon which any errors regarding William Bryant might have been based, and confusion would have been avoided. The errors alluded to however may now be dispensed with, and without doing violence to the facts.

The well established tradition, with which I have been familiar since early youth, that William Bryant while leading out a hunting party from Bryant's Station, was drawn into an ambushade by the Indians and was fired upon and wounded, but that he escaped and returned to the station, substantially corroborated by Col. Cave Johnson in his Autobiography, I do not feel disposed to reject as being without foundation in fact,

12. Sketches of Western Adventure, by McClung, page 166.

13. Chronicles of Border Warfare, by Withers, page 348.
William Bryan.

upon the statement of any one. Nor do I believe that he meant any else than William Bryant, in stating that William Bryant was so wounded. Col. Johnson himself took part in the hunting expedition, and was personally acquainted with the parties, and would have been as likely to know the correct name of the leader of this hunting expedition, and who he states was "the head and principle man of the families and station," quite as well as any one. Nor does he say that William Bryant was killed, or that he was mortally wounded. If there is any ambiguity in his account of the expedition, it is regarding the man who was mortally wounded in the fight which took place between Hogan's forces and the Indians, and at a time subsequent to the wounding of William Bryant and his return to Bryant's Station.

By reason of experience, courage and sagacity, and circumstances in life, William Bryant was the natural leader of the early inhabitants of Bryant's Station, and he was so regarded. A man of dauntless courage and splendid physique, (14) he was the one man above all others to whom the settlers most confidently looked for defense against the assaults of the Indians. During these early times he took a very active part in several engagements with the Indians, holding the rank of Captain under command of Cols. Todd and Boone. As already stated, he had returned to Kentucky at the close of the Revolutionary struggle, and had again taken up his residence at the fort. When the station was besieged by the Indian foe under command of Cols. Caldwell and McKee, aided and abetted by the infamous Simon Girty, he was one of the most active and vigilant of the defenders, if not actually in command of the fort, and was wounded in the assault upon the garrison, which disabled him to such an extent that he was not a participant in the battle of the Blue Licks which followed.

14. Mr. J. M. Bryant, of Cedar City, Mo., who was born in Estill county, Ky., March 10, 1825, retains a distinct recollection of his grandfather, William Bryant. He states that Wm. Bryant was about five feet ten inches in height and was heavily built. He bore across his nose and face a heavy scar, the result of a blow inflicted by an Indian tomahawk in a battle with the Indians. He also had several scars on his person received in encounters with the Indians.

William Bryant's wife was a near relative of Daniel Boone. I am unable to state the exact relationship, but the tradition is well established that she was related to Boone, and I have no doubt of its authenticity. Her name was Rachel Wilcox, and it is likely she was a daughter of John Wilcox, who married in North Carolina a sister of Boone. It is of course well known that Boone married Rebecca Bryan. Although of similar name, she was not related to William Bryant. Eight children, six sons and two daughters, were born to Wm. and Rachel Bryant.

I have no means of knowing how long William Bryant remained at Bryant's Station, but no doubt he resided there until Indian hostilities had subsided sufficiently to permit of the settlers moving onto the lands they had located and entered. The family removed to what is now known as Estill county. Three of the older sons, and probably the eldest daughter, were married in this county, and each of these three sons, Jeremiah, (15) Hiram and Thomas, (16) owned land in Estill County

15. Jeremiah Bryant, the eldest son, was born Aug. 20, 1791. He married Martha Plummer. Ten children were born to them as follows: Rachel, 1814; Christina, 1816; Susan, 1818; Crayton P., 1821; Cornelia, 1823; Jeremiah M., 1825; Martha, 1826; America, 1829; Amanda, 1831; Sarah T., 1833. Jeremiah Bryant, with his family removed from Kentucky to Missouri in 1832. In 1834 he returned to Kentucky on business, and on his return trip to Missouri he contracted the cholera and died on board a steamer on the Missouri River, July 11, and his remains were sunk beneath the waters of the Missouri. Some of his descendants yet remain in Callaway County, where he settled.

16. Thomas Bryant, the fourth child, was born January 10th, 1795. He married Polly Bennett in Estill County, Ky., December 11th, 1817, the marriage ceremony being performed by Joseph Proctor, who was a pioneer Methodist preacher and most courageous Indian fighter. Proctor participated in and was one of the survivors of Estill's defeat. He shot and killed the Indian who killed Captain Estill, and rescued William Irvine who was badly wounded, "after the most desperate and gallant exertions," conveying him to Bryant's Station where he made known the result of the sanguinary and disastrous conflict. Polly Bennett was a daughter of Thomas and Elizabeth (Proctor) Bennett, her mother being a sister of Joseph Proctor. The children of Thomas Bryant and wife were as follows: Jeremiah, 1818, died young; William, 1821; Joshua, 1823; Rachel, 1825; these were born in Estill County; Benjamin, 1827; Andrew Jackson, 1830; Lucretia, 1832; Deborah, 1835; Elvira, 1837; the latter were born in Clay County, Ky. In 1837, Thomas Bryant,

between the years 1825 and 1832. All the children with the exception of Hiram and Rachel sooner or later removed to Missouri, Thomas Bryant, grandfather of the writer hereof being the last to leave Kentucky in 1837.

William Bryant was a prosperous planter, owning a large amount of property, among which may be mentioned some sixty colored persons.

"First Runaway Slave Advertised North of the Ohio River. (17). March 22nd, 1794, Wm. Bryant, of Lincoln County, Ky., advertised a runaway negro, Sam, and offered \$10 reward for securing him so that his owner should have him again." (18)

Part of the present County of Estill formerly lay within the original County of Lincoln, and part of it within the original County of Fayette.

Kentucky's strenuous days were drawing to a close. The wilderness had been subdued, and for several years William Bryant lived quietly upon his farm, devoting his time to the cultivation of the soil. But many of his old time friends were either dead or had pushed still further westward, where the

being in poor health, removed with his family to Boone County, Mo., where he remained about two years, when he removed to Ripley County, where he died Sept. 5th, 1845. In 1846, his family removed to Wapello County, Iowa. Of the sons of Thomas Bryant, William was a soldier in the Mexican War, serving in a Missouri regiment; Benjamin Bryant, was a soldier in the War of the Rebellion, serving in Company B, 30th Iowa Vol. Infantry, and was honorably discharged on account of disability. He died Feb. 15th, 1902. He was a man of great moral and physical courage. Being an orator of much ability, he was prominent in the anti-slavery agitation, and long a leader in politics in his section of the country. Disease of eyes, throat and lungs contracted in the Civil War, greatly impaired his usefulness and activity, and in a great measure prevented his attaining eminence he might easily have done. He married in Shannon County, Missouri, Rachel Chilton, daughter of John and Lettice Carter Chilton, August 3, 1846, and they soon removed to Wapello County, Iowa, and later to Davis County. Twelve children were born to them, nine of whom attained to manhood and womanhood, as follows: Francis Asbury, 1851; Andrew Jackson, 1853; James Chilton, 1855; Lucy, (Mrs. M. M. Ralston,) 1858; Benjamin Bassett, 1860; Theodore Finis, 1862; William Cullen, 1865; John Carter Inman, 1868; Thomas Julian, 1873.

17. History of Kentucky, by R. H. Collins, Vol. 2, page 113.

18. In his last will he bequeathed certain negroes to some of his children.

population was less dense and where land could still be had for the asking. Daniel Boone and his family were among the number of those who had thus sought out a new home beyond the Mississippi, in the Territory of Louisiana. When Boone returned to Kentucky about the year 1810, on a mission which was highly creditable to him, what could have been more natural than that he should seek out his friend and former companion, who though advanced in years like himself, was still hale and vigorous, and pour into his willing ear the story of the new country which was not unlike the Kentucky of early days.

Missouri was soon to be formed into a Territory, and Statehood was only a matter of time. Wm. Bryant soon resolved that when the time should seem propitious, he too, would take up his residence in this new country. Having disposed of such of his property as he did not wish to carry with him, he with his wife and the younger members of the family, took up the line of march and in due time they reached the Territory of Missouri, first settling upon the waters of Femme Osage, not far from the Boone settlement. (19) And thus again Daniel Boone and William Bryant had become pioneers. Within a year or so after reaching their new home, Bryant's wife who had been a true and faithful companion for many years passed away. Most of his children having by this time established homes of their own, he was left practically alone in the world. About this time he returned to Kentucky, where he and his son Hiram Bryant, shortly became involved in litigation (20) over some land they were occupying, and it appears that a judgment in ejectment was rendered against them in 1818, and soon thereafter he returned to Missouri, which was to be his home for the future, and whose soil was finally to receive his remains.

Upon the subsequent events of his life, his second marriage at an advanced age, the loss of a considerable portion of his property, and other events, it is not my purpose here to

19. History of Missouri, by Louis Houck.

20. Lessees of Samuel Smith vs. Robert Trabue's Heirs, U. S. Supreme Court Reports, 9 Peters, page 4.

dwell. To the end, he was the same independent and courageous man that he had been in the earlier days, when with such men as Daniel Boone he was helping subdue the wilderness of Kentucky, not inclined to indulge in the exploitation of the stirring scenes through which he had passed, or of the part he had taken in them; and with character by no "foul dishonor" sullied, he rounded out the measure of a long and active life.

A few words more, and our narrative is finished.

About a year after the death of his friend, Col. Boone, William Bryant (1821) removed to Boone County, Mo., (21) where he resided until the date of his death, which occurred in 1834, at the advanced age of ninety-five years.

And today in an old neglected cemetery, on a high hill overlooking the Missouri River as it rolls to join the "Father of Waters," and near the site of the vanished town of Stonesport, (22) in the County bearing the name of his friend of many years, rest the remains of William Bryant, (23) soldier of the Revolutionary War, founder of the pioneer Kentucky fort known in history as Bryant's Station, founder of a family in the New World, and compatriot and friend of the celebrated Daniel Boone.

I shall never cease to be mindful of the fact that I trace my lineage to Kentucky sires, who have done their full share toward spreading civilization in the Western World, but who have neither sought to magnify their own achievements nor

21. The early records of Boone County, show conveyances of land by certain grantors to William Briant. (See Deed Record F, page 4.) On the margin of Deed Record A, page 292, is the following: "Wm. Briant's last will and testament, Aug. 1, 1824." In conveying lands, however, his signature appears as William Bryant, and his name is so given in the record and on the original will. (See Deed Record C, page 266; Deed Record E, page 397.)

Singularly enough, John Filson, the first historian of Kentucky in the so-called Autobiography of Daniel Boone, published in 1784, fell into the same error regarding the spelling of the name, and in referring to Bryant's Station he called it "Briant's Station." The error was corrected, however, by the subsequent historians.

22. Stonesport was located about a mile up the River from the present village of Claysville.

23. A large cottonwood tree stands at the head of William Bryant's grave.

underrate the deeds of others; and shall ever hold in grateful remembrance the name of him who with strong hands carved a name imperishable in history. I esteem beyond expression, all those brave heroic souls, both men and women, who in the face of untold hardship and peril wrested the soil of the "Dark and Bloody Ground" from the hands of its savage possessors, and gave to the sisterhood of States the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

THOMAS JULIAN BRYANT.

Red Oak, Iowa.

A GERMAN COMMUNISTIC SOCIETY IN MISSOURI

The last decades of the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries were marked by concentrated action on the part of various organizations to establish communistic settlements. A great number of these attempts were made in the United States. The Shakers, the Harmonists, the Separatists of Zoar, the Perfectionists, the Communities of Robert Owen and Brook Farm are but a few of the leading communistic attempts of this period. In a number of these unique religious principles obtained and formed the bond of union between its members. Others again were held together by constitutional agreement for the sole purpose of economic betterment. Still others had for their aim the communion of highminded and highly intellectual individuals who sought the association of kindred minds, and who under the idyllic conditions of communal life hoped for an amelioration of conditions intellectual and spiritual.

Among the minor communities is classed the one at Bethel in Shelby County, Missouri. In some respects this society is unique. It existed from 1844 to 1879, without the semblance of a constitutional agreement. It had no peculiar dress, nor singular customs. The sole bond of union was the magnetic power and iron will of its founder. In a measure it may be said that its purpose was to carry out the whim of its founder and leader, but many of its members joined because they foresaw an immediate betterment of economic conditions. Its constituency, with the exception of a very few persons, consisted of Germans, who had either come directly from the Fatherland, or who had already become naturalized in the various parts of the United States. Nordhoff in his work: "Communistic Societies in the United States," page 319, says that several Protestant sects were represented, that there was even one

Jew, but no Roman Catholics. (1) The site of the colony was on North River in Shelby County, Missouri, forty-eight miles from Hannibal.

Its organization took place in 1844 and the body remained intact until 1879 or shortly after the death of its founder—Doctor William Keil. Soon after the settlement was established in Shelby County, 3536 acres of land were purchased or entered near the present site of Bethel. This town became the center of activity. Other groups of houses near Bethel received the names of Elim, Hebron and Mamri. In Adair County, not far from Kirksville, 731 acres of land were acquired and the town there established received the name of Nineveh. (2) In 1855, for reasons hereafter to be discussed, it was decided to divide the society, a large number of its members following Dr. Keil to Washington Territory, and later to Oregon Territory. Thus an unique condition in communistic life came about in that two bodies of people, so far separated as the State of Missouri and the Territory of Oregon, could be controlled by one head, at a time when communication was slow and difficult, and all this too with a body that was not held together by any written agreement. As stated previously, the singularly powerful will of Keil was the force that held this society intact. When this force disappeared by Keil's death, and no successor appeared strong enough to rule, the natural result was a dissolution of the organization, and a division of the acquired property. The dissolution is itself strikingly interesting, in that it was affected in the simplest manner possible and with very little friction.

Since the whole life of the society—as was pointed out already—was concentrated in the iron, indomitable will of William Keil, it will be necessary to preface the more detailed account of this study by a consideration of his life

1. This statement of Nordhoff's applies directly to the Aurora, Oregon, settlement which was the daughter colony of the Bethel, Missouri, colony, as will be discussed in detail later on. But all of the members at Aurora had been members at Bethel or were their direct descendants, hence the statement may be regarded as applicable to the Missouri community also.

2. Now it is called Connelville.

and activity. I base my account of Keil's life on: 1. A mass of letters written by himself to members of the society at Bethel; 2. On statements of trustworthy persons at Bethel, Missouri, and Aurora, Oregon,—not only those who praise Keil but also those who defame him,—and 3. On brief accounts found in the various histories of communistic life in this country, but especially on the account of the early years of Keil's life, as found in a rare and odd book by a clergyman, Carl G. Koch, who at one time was an ardent adherent to Keil's views, entitled: "Lebenserfahrungen," printed 1871 in Cleveland, Ohio, in the Verlagshaus der Evangelischen Gemeinschaft.

Of Keil's early life we have no further record than that he was born on the sixth of March 1811 in Bleicherode, District of Erfurt, Prussia. His parents were German, and seem to have been of the middle class. (3) It goes without saying that he must have attended the elementary schools of his town. There is no record of his attending a technical school or university. It is very doubtful, indeed, whether he was legally entitled to the title of Doctor, altho he is said to have practiced medicine in this country with apparent success. In his home country he followed the profession of man-milliner. He practiced his trade in Koellede, District of Merseburg, Prussia. He is said to have been very handsome in his youth and a most excellent workman and very industrious. Nordhoff gives us a picture of the man as he saw him in this country. (4) He describes him as a "short, burly man, with blue eyes, whitish hair and white beard." Nordhoff continues: "He seemed excitable and somewhat suspicious; gave no token whatever of having studied any book but the Bible, and that only as it helped him to enforce his own philosophy. He was very quick to turn every thought toward the one subject of community life; took his illustrations mostly

3. The statement of Hinds, in his "American Communities," page 287, in which he states that Keil was born in Nordhausen, Germany, is, according to the best sources, fallacious.

4. "Communistic Societies in the U. S.," page 318.

from the New Testament; and evidently laid much stress on the parental character of God. As he discussed, his eyes lighted up with a somewhat fierce fire; and I thought I could perceive a fanatic, certainly a person of very determined, imperious will united to a narrow creed." I have been fortunate in securing from Jacob G. Miller of Aurora, Oregon, who was one of the leaders at Bethel, a large number of letters from Dr. Keil to the remaining members at Bethel. Most of these letters were written by his secretary, Karl Ruge, a college bred man, and are in fairly good style. Those written by himself are wretched illustrations of letter writing and show a most imperfect knowledge of his own language. His pictures show him as a man with broad and high forehead, rather thick nose and a square chin—in other words, the type of a strong animal with indomitable will and bull-dog tenacity.

It seems to be the prerogative of men of Keil's profession to be moody. Their work does not absorb their mental energy completely, and so they are frequently found to be the possessors of the most fanciful notions. Keil's pet inclination was first the stage. This did not prevail long, however. Soon he became a religious enthusiast and subsequently a devotee of such mystics as Jacob Boehme and his followers. He now began an investigation for an "Universalmedizin," a panacea which should heal all the ills the human flesh is heir to. This whim led him to a superficial study of botany, and in his fanciful search he no doubt got some smattering ideas of medicine. He made innumerable experiments to solve the laws of nature and to probe into the mystery of life. His queer experiments he continued even after he came to this country. Koch asserts that Keil showed him a flask in his (Keil's) drug store in Pittsburg, Pa., which contained a fluid which Keil purported to represent the product of his long investigation. He claimed to be in possession of mysterious cures which he avowed to have received from an old woman. It is said that this person would not have parted with these secrets under any consideration, provided he did not leave the country. Thus

Keil came in possession of these secrets before he came to the United States. Most probably these mysterious secrets were powwowing formulae, of which so many exist in certain parts of Germany, and so many of which are to this day found among the inhabitants, particularly the Germans, of Pennsylvania.

The exact date of Keil's coming to America is not positively fixed. It is very probable, however, that it was in 1835 or 36. He lived for a short time in New York City and then came to Pittsburg. Soon after his arrival in Pittsburg, he performed some strange cures, as it seems, somewhat in the manner of our modern magnetic healers, and was soon dubbed with the unsavory title of "Der Hexendokter," by the common people.

In 1838 Dr. William Nast, the founder of the German Methodist Church, conducted revival meetings in Pittsburg. Keil attended these meetings and became converted. Soon after his religious awakening, he met the Reverend J. Martin Hartmann, whom he claimed as his real spiritual father. This Hartmann was deeply interested in the principles of communism, and it is very probable that he augmented, if he did not give the initiative to Keil's closer consideration of Community life. At a Quarterly Meeting held October 12th, 1839, at Stewardstown, Pennsylvania, he was licensed as local preacher, having previously shown much enthusiasm in religious work as Class leader. It is stated, however, that this license was never formally issued. The first field of church activity for Keil as local preacher was at Deer Creek, near Pittsburg. Dr. Nast, in an interview with Koch, stated that in his opinion Keil seemed perfectly sincere in his conversion, and that at the outset of his ministerial career he was deeply concerned and eager to do good. For Keil the period of probation which the church imposed on him, as it does on all who come under its ruling, was extremely irksome, and frequent and urgent were his appeals to be given full charge of a congregation. Dr. Nast adds a queer story, in which he states that Keil was possessor of a mysterious book, written for the most

part in blood, and which contained all sorts of mystic symbols and formulae, unintelligible to any one but Keil. These secrets were nothing more, I take it, than the pow-wow formulae which had been communicated to Keil by the old woman above mentioned. After his conversion Keil invited Nast and several brethren to witness the burning of this mysterious book which was regarded as the work of the devil. The destruction of the old volume took place amid certain ceremonies and prayer. Hartmann is said to have humored Keil in his pet notions concerning religions, and to have stimulated him in his striving to ascend faster than the church usually permits its servants to rise. Thus encouraged and humored Keil soon became unruly. He rebelled against the church and its tenets. Then came his separation from the Methodist Episcopal Church. He avowed that he could not work in a church where men served God for pay. He adhered to the Biblical injunction: "Freely ye have received, freely give." He was opposed to Hartmann receiving \$400 from the missionary fund and certain stipulated sums of "Classmoney" as salary. When Keil's superiors waived these objections, he withdrew from the church, taking the entire congregation at Deer Creek with him. Thus Keil early demonstrated that he could not obey, that he had to rule. He gave up his medical practice entirely and devoted himself to independent preaching. He had no income, save what his members saw fit to voluntarily give him. The work as independent preacher circumscribed his field of activity too much, however, so he joined the Protestant Methodist Church. The entire congregation at Deer Creek again followed him blindly. Now he extended his work into the "Point," that is the lower part of Pittsburg, where he made many converts among the iron-workers and factory employes. Refusing to obey the superiors of the Protestant Methodist Church, its head, the Reverend Geissinger saw himself compelled to exclude him from this body. With Keil the entire congregation again severed their connection with the church. Keil continued to de-

nounce all ministerial service for pay as un-Christian; all sectarianism, all church regulation as the work of human hands and unessential to the moral teachings of Christianity. He renounced all title save that of Christian; accepted no rule save the admonitions given in the Bible. To serve Christ, not man, he claimed his sole aim. To act according to the Golden Rule; to live a moral pure life was the gist of his teaching. His whole congregation accepted these views implicitly and devotedly clung to him as their leader.

All this had transpired in rapid succession before 1840. Those who have heard Keil's preaching still assert that he was a forceful and fluent speaker. Believing him to be sincere they clung to him lovingly and devotedly, and spread his fame among those with whom they came in contact. Soon his fame extended to regions far removed from Pittsburg. Among his ardent followers were young men of talent and the gift of speech. Foremost among these were Karl G. Koch, the same who wrote "*Lebensaufzeichnungen*," and three brothers; Christian, Andrew and Henry Geisy, as it is seen from the names, all Germans. The entire body of Keil's adherents at this time was composed of Germans. The young men whose names were given above, Keil sent out to preach his views among the Germans in the various parts of this country. They traveled for the most part on foot, preaching, in accordance with Keil's teaching, without money and without price, in the settlements of Germans, wherever they could get a hearing. They preached in private houses and in school buildings, and lodged with such persons in whom Keil's views seemed to find fruitful ground. Disdaining to adhere to any established creed, they followed their leader in taking as the cornerstone of their spiritual edifice the teachings of the Apostolic Fathers. Rapidly the work spread until it extended thru western Pennsylvania, southern Ohio, West Virginia, Indiana, Kentucky, even to Iowa, where in Bloomington, (now Muscatine) and Iowa City, and other places small groups of the "faithful" assembled. In Ohio the influence extended thru the counties of Columbiana, Stark, Trumbull, Monroe and Washington. Sometimes Keil would follow the course his

disciples had taken and strive to bring to a culmination the work they had begun and fostered. More and more Keil was regarded as an extraordinary man, and those outside of his magnetic influence assert, even today, that he regarded himself as such. His former love for the mystics asserted itself in him again. He preached in the manner of Jacob Boehm and charged his deputies to do the same. His unsophisticated followers stood aghast before this unheard-of wisdom. Moreover Keil knew how to perplex them by telling them that he had visions. The book of Daniel and the book of Revelations afforded him many a favorite text. Sometimes he perverted the text completely if his purpose was thereby the better accomplished. One time he is said to have made the startling assertion that on a certain day he would be publicly sacrificed. Throngs of people arrived to view the spectacle, some curious, some deeply concerned. Of course no untoward thing befell him. The explanation was simple enough for him—the Lord still had a mission for him to fulfill. Persons outside the pale of his influence believed that his followers worshiped Keil more than Christ. In fact it is vouched that women, carried away by his preaching and entering into a peculiar hypnotic state, cried out: "Thou art Christ." At my last visit to Bethel, I met a man who himself had been a member of the community, who made the statement that Keil's wife, (whose maiden name, by the way, was Ritter), called on the speaker's father who had refused to join the society,—having known Keil in Germany and doubting his supernatural gifts,—and that Mrs. Keil, in the heat of the argument, made the startling assertion that her husband was as great as Christ himself. To such laudations Keil is said to have remained silent. The devotion of Keil's followers was certainly great and his influence over them grew from day to day. Keil knew well how to make use of all the demonstrations of loyalty they might bring him. After some time young Koch could not share Keil's views any longer and he frankly told him so. Keil used all the argumentative power at his command to hold him under his control, for he feared that

Koch had a strong influence. The latter withdrew, however, and sought in every way to enlighten the people in regard to his opinion of Keil. But very few paid any heed to his admonitions. The other preachers remained faithful to Keil. Keil designated himself as the "Centralsonne," central sun, and the leading subordinates received the title of "Lichtfuersten" and "Lichtfuerstinnen," princes and princesses of light.

At Phillipsburg, 28 miles below Pittsburg, on the Ohio River, a large body of Keil's followers lived. This town will be of interest to us in this study, as here the project of Keil's Community took definite form.

In 1805 George Rapp had established the famous Harmony Society—one of the largest communistic undertakings in the United States. (5) This society existed at Economy, Pa., only a few miles from Phillipsburg. In 1831 the visionary Bernhard Mueller, better known in the studies of communistic societies by the high-sounding title of Count Maximilian de Leon, arrived with a body of followers at Economy, and was admitted by Rapp into the Harmony Society. (6) Mueller caused trouble by preaching, to the younger generation, at Economy especially, the doctrine of greater personal liberty, and especially the right to live in the married state,—a privilege which the Harmony Society, according to the celibacy clause of its constitution, forbade. It soon became necessary for Rapp to take a determined stand. A vote was taken, and 176 persons who had been members of the society followed Count de Leon. (7) An indemnity was paid to the seceding members. After this separation Mueller and his followers betook themselves to Phillipsburg, where he established a colony on communistic principles, barring the celibacy provision and other strict rules of the Rapp Colony. After a short time Mueller was

5. John Bole's "The Harmony Society," International Press, Philadelphia.

6. Nordhoff's "Communistic Societies in the United States," pages 79 and 80; also Koch "Lebenserfahrungen," p. 129 ff; Bole's "The Harmony Society," p. 124 ff.

7. Cf. Bole's "The Harmony Society," p. 125.

entrapped in fraudulence and was compelled to flee to Arkansas, where a few of his adherents followed him. A large portion of his old charge remained in Phillipsburg. Despite the disastrous experience, which they had had with two communistic societies, many of them regarded communistic life as the only ideal way of living. They maintained that all that was necessary, was a leader of strong personality and undoubted integrity. In Keil they saw the ideal leader for such an undertaking. No doubt Keil himself was not very reluctant either, and so the beginning was made for the society which I wish to discuss. Here Keil foresaw such a chance to rule as he had never had before. The former members of the disbanded Leon Colony, as well as those who had been with Rapp gave Keil many hints concerning communistic undertakings. One of the things which they recommended to Keil as an especially strong factor in holding the people under one's control, was the practice of requiring confession from the members of the organization. Rapp had done this with great success. This confession consisted in subjecting the people to a series of questions on very delicate topics. It appealed to Keil. As a matter of experiment he instituted this confession in his church. Being subject to none of the older churches, he could do so with impunity. He had the young people come to him alone; the married people, however, were forced to come husband and wife together. Most of the interrogations, to which he subjected them, pertained to sex and sexual relations. Some of the persons turned from him in disgust, but many did confess sincerely. The strife which he thus conjured up in some of the families was very bitter, and the happy relations of many homes were unnecessarily disturbed. In his sermons he is said to have spoken freely of these things, and he made use of the information thus attained to intimidate the simple folk and to scourge them into line, to more easily compel them to do his bidding. Believing that he would be successful in a communistic venture, and feeling the great influence he had over the people in his charge, he definitely decided on the organization

of such a society. He counseled carefully with the ex-Harmonists and the ex-Leonists. They having had experience in such matters and being men of rare ability as mechanics and artisans, he solicited their participation most earnestly. The number of the ex-communists was, however, too small for his undertaking. It was therefore necessary that more persons should become interested in the undertaking. The capacity of preacher had made him acquainted with a great many persons in various regions of this country. He knew, too, that he had a certain influence over them. Accordingly he sent out his messengers to the various communities where his deputies had preached. A general invitation was issued for all to join the undertaking. The advantages were not too much discussed, in order that there might not be too many discontented parties. The only offer which Keil is said to have held forth is that the participants in the attempt should have plenty of work and bread and water. But so certain was he of his power over these people, that he doubted not that many of them would willingly join him, in order that they might be under the immediate supervision of a man whom they regarded as more than ordinary. A number of those appealed to did accept the call. As fast as they could dispose of their property, they joined the society. I do not wish to be understood as saying that the majority of those who had come under the pale of Keil's preaching and the preaching of his deputies joined. Many of them had no wish of giving up individualism. Then, too, Karl Koch was very active in his attempts to prevent the people from joining. The ex-Harmonists and ex-Leonists who expressed a willingness to participate insisted on having a written constitution. Accordingly such a document was drawn up. But as the people could not agree as to certain provisions it contained, Keil was called in and the matter submitted to him. He at once declared most emphatically that under no condition would he go bound and fettered by any written agreement. If a man's word was not as good as a written law, then he could and would have nothing to do with the entire project.

The Bible should be the foundation of the society which he proposed to found; the Golden Rule should be its motto. It is most interesting to know that such an old document did exist in the Bethel Community. It is usually stated, even by ex-members, that there was never any written agreement. For practical purposes this is true enough, for it was never put into effect. But as a matter of historic fact, it is interesting to know that an attempt was made to build the society on a written agreement. The finder of this old document would be lucky indeed. The old gentleman in whose possession it was last found believes that it was destroyed with a mass of other old papers. He recalled, however, that some of the provisions set forth therein, pertained to the admission and dismissal of members. Moreover he states that this writ provided that young men who were taken into the society were forbidden to marry before the expiration of the third year of their membership. Furthermore it must not be overlooked that this was the time when the agitation of the Mormon affairs made exclusive societies of this nature very unpopular, in Missouri at any rate. Under the proposed arrangement the society had no legal existence. The various members must hold the property of the body in trust. The Bethel Society remained an unincorporated body of persons until its dissolution. It was only a voluntary gathering of like-minded individuals. Nothing could possibly testify more ably to the astonishing power of Dr. Keil. For thirty-four years he was able to rule this extremely loosely-knit body dogmatically and dictated its policies to his own liking.

It has been made to appear by certain writers on this subject that the followers of Keil were an ignorant lot who knew nothing but to toil. I am not willing to accept this affirmation without qualification. The majority of the members consisted of common toilers, to be sure, who brought naught but their willing hands. But is not every community made up in this manner? I have found among the surviving colonists men rather well-read, and extremely shrewd in business matters. Moreover I have conclusive

proof that many of them possessed information that would have placed them side by side with the better informed men of an average community; men who were far more intellectual than Dr. Keil, their leader. Notable among these was Karl Ruge, a college-bred man prepared for the legal profession, who came to America with the great number of intellectual aristocrats in 1848. Here too is to be remembered Henry Finck, a master in music, to whom is due, in a large measure, the high position which the Colony at Bethel took as a center of music lovers in those early days. One of his sons has become a noted musical critic in New York City, while the other has made his mark as an attorney at law in the same metropolis. Nor must I pass by the great number of artisans whose handiwork still remains at Bethel as the strongest testimonial of their ability. Then there were men of the type of C. Wolf, who, conscious of their own strength and ability, had the temerity to oppose even Dr. Keil in some of his undertakings. After deliberate, impartial and unbiased examination I am prepared to gainsay the statement that the colony consisted of ignorant men only. In trying to solve the problem as to why it was possible for Keil to gather so large a body of followers around him, it may be that Hinds in his "American Communities," (8) has found the right solution. He says: "I can only account for this by recalling, that when Dr. Keil began his independent career the people of the Eastern and Middle States had just passed through a series of religious and other excitements, that made them eager for new social conditions, and so quick to follow those who offered to lead them where such new conditions would prevail, and by supposing that Dr. Keil, however foolish his fanaticism and preposterous his claims, had yet wonderful powers of gaining and holding the attention and hearts of men." What effect Keil had on the intellectual life of the colony after its founding is another question which will be considered in due time.

In the spring of 1844 the plans had matured sufficiently to make imperative the search for a location for the new colony. Of the instructions which the three deputies: Adam Schuele, David Wagner and Christian Presser took with them, as they wandered west in search of land, we know nothing. Most probably they were never transmitted to writing, as nearly all the orders and transactions were oral, and without any tangible form. It seems reasonable to assume that Keil gave directions to the effect that they should find land in a region virgin in nature, where the contaminating influences of advanced civilization did not obtain to affect the new settlement. They selected a site in one of the choicest agricultural regions of Missouri. It is located in Shelby County on the North River. The place is not particularly romantic but for the purpose of the settlement there were many advantages connected with this location. According to the "History of Monroe and Shelby Counties," (9) Peter Stice lived here at the time of the purchase by the colony and operated a saw mill, using the water of the North River as motor power. According to the same source three other land owners were located here—Rockwood, Vandiver, and Chinn. Their land was acquired by the colony. Other tracts were later entered from the government.

In the autumn of 1844 Keil and his family together with George Miller and a few others arrived in this western wild. They spent the winter amid considerable hardship, dwelling in some of the old log houses on and near the purchase. Vandiver possessed a good brick house which was built about 1840, and is still inhabited to this day. Here, most probably, some of the colonists found shelter, for the hospitality of the Missourian of that day has become proverbial. In the spring of 1845 many other colonists arrived. They did not all come at the same time, but they arrived as they were able to dispose of their possessions at home. Some of them purchased a boat to come down the

9. Page 361 f.

Ohio and up the Mississippi. There joined themselves to these men a number of adventurers who did not have the cause of the society at heart. The result was that the society grew rather rapidly, in fact too rapidly. For the adventurers soon became dissatisfied and severed their connection, often causing a good deal of unpleasantness and defaming the undertaking before the world. They could not attack Keil personally, for he had promised them nothing but hard work and bread and water. As has already been indicated, the members came from every region into which Keil had sent his deputies.

The men of the hour were the former members of the Harmony Society. Schooled in the ways of communistic life, and complete masters of some trade, they became the saviors in time of imminent danger and need. The names of these ex-Rappites are, according to the memory of the old men at Bethel, the following: Adam Schuele, Matheus Schuele, Jacob Veihinger, John C. Bauer, Michael Forstner, George Forstner, George Ziegler, David Wagner, Adam Keller, Christian Smith, Samuel Schreiber, and George Schnaufer. Some of these men who were especially skilled in some trade were urged by Keil to join the society. Others came of their own free will. Having had experience, however, with Rapp and Leon, some of them would not join without imposing certain conditions. So they proposed to belong to the society for a specified time only. If at the expiration of this time the society pleased them, they would continue as members. If, on the other hand, the affair was not to their liking, they reserved the right to be free to withdraw. This was a rather odd condition to enter into on the part of Keil, but he needed these men exceedingly much in his new enterprise. Some of these men, in fact the greater number, it is said, withdrew at the end of the time specified in their agreement. It is impossible to find a written statement concerning this compact. Most probably it was only a verbal agreement, as most of the transactions of the society were of this nature. The word of a man was as good as his signed statement. Since these men

had conduced to the stock of the society, they demanded the return of their investment. As the money had been spent in the acquisition and the improvement of the property of the colony, they could not be paid in cash. Hence certain pieces of property were assigned them as a remuneration. Their services to the colony having been most valuable, it is not hard to understand that they should demand some of the choice tracts of land. This demand had to be complied with, and so these men who had no more connection with the society became possessors of some of the finest building-sites in Bethel. One of the most flagrant cases of this kind was that of John C. Bauer. He decided not to leave the town of Bethel although he had volunteered, on strength of the above named compact, to sever his connection with the colony. Many attempts were made to "freeze him out," as a surviving kinsman of his puts it, but without success. Bauer was such an excellent mechanic that the society constantly had to employ him, when they found themselves in a predicament. So he continued to ply his trade with a good deal of success. Thus a strange condition had come about. In the midst of communism there was the purest individualism. Simple as the whole matter is it seems quite hazy in the minds of some of the writers of this subject. Hinds in his work "American Communities," (10) says: "A small store in the heart of the village was owned and managed by an outsider. The explanation of this singular state of things is found in the fact that a few years after the founding of the community, to satisfy the malcontents, a partition of the property was made among the members, and a few availed themselves of the opportunity to withdraw their share from the common interest, and have since managed it wholly for themselves." Now this statement is misleading. There was no general division of the property at this time, as the above statement would imply. The young men who owned and operated the store in question were the sons of John C. Bauer. They

10. Page 293.

erected their place of business on the site which their father had received, as per agreement, which was made before they left Pennsylvania. All those who received a title to property at Bethel at this time had an agreement of the kind stated above. They cannot be called malcontents in the true sense, since they had a definite understanding with Keil to stay with him for a certain time only. In granting them property, Keil fulfilled only his part of the contract, they having already fulfilled their part. These sons of John C. Bauer, who, by the way, are now spelling their names Bower, operated a very successful general merchandise business, selling to outsiders as well as to members of the society—for it must be remembered that this society which, so to speak, stands on the borderline of communism, allowed its members to have some private earnings. This income they were not compelled to turn over to the general coffers, and thus had some money to spend for things which the society store did not provide them with. From their gardens they also made some private earnings, and so the strange mixture of communism and individualism, manifested at Bethel, finds an easy, logical and historical solution when the above facts and agreements are kept in mind.

Keil had been, and was still at the founding of the colony in Missouri, a religious enthusiast or if you choose a fanatic. For most of his action he cited parallel instances in the Bible. In accordance with such an inclination he called the places he founded on the North River after Bible names: Bethel, Elim, Mamri and Hebron while in Adair County the place was named Nineveh. His ardor seems to have died out, however, for in Oregon he named the only place there founded by him after a favorite daughter of his—Aurora.

Soon after the most necessary needs had been met, the colonists proceeded to erect a church building. They spared no pains and trouble in making it a magnificent place of worship. All the skill of the local artisans and artists was represented in this edifice. It was constructed

of brick and stone and finished in the most beautiful black walnut, of which an abundance grew on the banks of the North. According to Nordhoff, (11) the floor was made of large red tiles, and a narrow pulpit stood at one end. There were two doors, one for each of the sexes. The men and women sat on separate sides of the room. I am told by persons who saw the old church that a spacious gallery ran along three sides of this hall, a portion of which was railed off for the band which played on festival occasions. This gallery was faced with large and neatly carved panels of black walnut, 18 by 24 inches in size, and all of one entire piece of wood. In the massive tower hung three bells. When I remarked to one of the old members that this building must have been an enormous expense to the young colony, he said with an air of great pride that the whole church cost them nothing save what they had to expend for window glass, nails and the three bells. All the rest of this fine structure was prepared by the colonists themselves. This church was the pride of the community as well as the entire County of Shelby. One can scarcely interview an old resident of Shelby County who knew the colony in its palmy days, who does not make reference to this magnificent edifice. In this church the colonists assembled every two weeks to hear Dr. Keil "preach" as they called it. As Keil professed allegiance to none of the established churches, he had no particular doctrine to uphold or defend. As one of the old men told me, he simply preached the doctrine of moral living. One hears so many contradictory reports concerning Keil, and is told so often that he indulged in excess himself, that it is difficult to see how he could have had unalloyed success. However, he had such a firm grip on his people, that they feared him and did not raise a voice against him. The chief aim of his preaching seems to have been to induce his followers to lead a moral life; to assert his authority; to compel the members to be industrious and thus foster the progress of the community. The

strongest weapons he had were employed to instill fear and respect of his authority in his members. To give a concrete notion of his preaching, I shall cite a specific incident which was communicated to me by a wholly truthful person. Whether through the system of confession which he made use of, or in some other way Keil had an inkling that some of his members were guilty of illicit carnal intercourse. He resorted to the following drastic measures to expose the malefactors and to check the evil. In open meeting he made known his findings, and in conclusion charged those concerned to arise there and then before the assembly or upon failure to do so he would announce their names. So terrified were the guilty ones and under such awe they stood before the man, that they arose at once, confessed their guilt and penitently bowed before the fearful upbraiding which was hurled at them from the pulpit. The most natural thing imaginable, namely that they would leave the community, the scene of their disgrace, did not happen. They remained and bore in contrition the contumely which followed such a confession or exposure.

Since Keil and his followers had no obligations to any established church, it was but natural that the usual observances of the church should be omitted. Thus they did away with baptism; they had no more confirmation, a custom which many of the members had been used to in Germany; they did not celebrate the Lord's Supper in the orthodox manner; if they observed it at all, it took the form of a general meal at the home of some member. The confession which Keil made use of, he employed solely for the purpose of instilling fear for his authority.

The church which is represented at Bethel now—for the days of the old Keil church has long passed—is the Methodist Episcopal. The services are all in the English language. A few years ago a German Methodist Church existed, but it had to be abandoned for want of support. In the building which the German Methodists owned, the Christian Church has begun to hold its meetings.

One of Keil's former followers told me that none of Keil's old members joined the Methodist Church after the dissolution of the society. They had gotten so out of tune with the old churches that they could not make themselves comply with their teachings, and so remained without the pale of all church organization. The membership of the existing church at Bethel is made up of the younger generation in the town and of the surrounding country. The following significant statement of an old Keilite will throw some light on the subject of their attitude towards the church: "The churches do no harm as long as the preachers behave themselves."

There were several festivals during the year which were always celebrated in grand style. First among these was Keil's birthday which was always a colony holiday. Then came Easter and Pentecost and the Harvestfeast in the autumn. On these occasions great tables were spread and loaded with all the things that the German kitchen and cellar could offer. These feasts were held at Elim, the residence of Keil. Everybody was welcome and from far and wide the people came to share in the feast. A procession was formed in Bethel which, led by the band, marched to Elim. The band also played during the entire time of the feast. No charges were imposed, and all strangers were made to feel comfortable. In the evening there was dancing. The real purpose of this almost unparalleled generosity is not well known. Whether it be that they wished to induce outsiders to come into the fold of the society or whether it was simply pure altruism on the part of the colonists, I am not prepared to say. At Christmas time the church was decorated with two huge Christmas trees. The celebration which was rather unique took place at the early hour of four on Christmas day. To this occasion also hosts of strangers arrived. The program consisted of a talk by the preacher, congregational singing and music by the band. Then huge baskets of cakes and apples and quantities of candy were distributed. Colonists and strangers shared absolutely equal. The trees were allowed to remain stand-

ing until New Year's day and then its gifts were distributed among the children of the colony. This beautiful celebration was in time interrupted by rowdy elements which came from the surrounding region, and so, rather than compelling them to be orderly and thereby possibly making enemies, this unique custom was abandoned.

The description of the colony church logically suggests the mention of other structures and the prevailing style of architecture. As stated before, the site of the Bethel settlement is not particularly interesting, in fact it is almost wholly devoid of all that might be termed romantic. Most of the buildings and their surroundings do not help to alleviate the prosaic effect. The buildings are made to serve practical purposes, and are almost totally barren of all ornamentation. They are usually made of brick which the colonists made themselves, stone which was quarried along the North, and timber which was hewn and sawed in the surrounding forest. The houses are built close to the street. Most of them have no front yard whatever. The architecture is of that very plain style so common in many old German settlements of this state. The eaves drip on the street and there often is no porch at the entrance. The structures are carefully put up, however, and seem to be capable of surviving yet many a decade. In some instances a wooden framework was erected and the intervening spaces were filled with brick and mortar. These buildings were plastered both on the inside and outside. The hinges and locks are handmade.

Soon after the colonists came to Bethel they erected a steam burr-mill. All the shafts and things of this nature were made of hard wood. They also established a distillery, a tannery and a colony laundry. All these institutions needed much hot water. For economy a large boiler was purchased for the mill and this was made to supply the other three industries with hot water. Then the problem of how to convey the water to these various buildings had to be met. Metal pipes they could not afford nor were they easily obtainable. Here the colonists showed their inventiveness.

They took long, straight beams, about twenty feet in length and a foot or a foot and a half in diameter at the larger end and with a specially constructed bit, they drilled a two-inch hole thru the entire beam. By hollowing out the larger end and tapering the other they effected a joint which by wrapping with flax or hemp dipped in tar they rendered tolerably water-tight. From this one illustration it must be apparent that these people were very inventive indeed. Many of the Germans whom Keil gathered around him and especially the former adherents of Rapp and Leon were skilled artisans. At every turn one meets evidences of their aptitude. Altho the product of their labor is sometimes crude, it nevertheless shows what they were able to do. Apparently there were master workmen for every kind of labor, but especially apt were they in working in iron and wood. The old mill and distillery were destroyed by fire but a part of the old tannery stands to this day. Here, too, one is impressed with the inventiveness of the workmen. In those days all the fixtures and all the tools had to be made by hand. Altho they pursued this industry only in a small way, they nevertheless gained considerable proficiency in tanning. Their shoes were carefully made and strong, and many outsiders, especially those who owned slaves, purchased their workshoes here. In those days the deer was found in large numbers in North Missouri. Their hides furnished gloves which were made under the supervision of the head-glovemaker Adolph Pflugk. These gloves are said to have been of excellent make. That they really must have been of superior quality and workmanship is attested by the fact that in 1858 they took a first premium at an exhibition in New York City. (12)

For the operation of the tannery much oak bark was necessary. The colonists did not like to rob their own trees of their bark. So they ascertained where an outsider contemplated clearing. They went to him made the proposition to hew down his large oak trees on condition that he

12. "History of Monroe and Shelby Counties." P. 363.

would allow them to peel off the bark for their own use. When such permission was obtained, all men, regardless of the trade they plied in the colony, went to the woods, performed this task in common and conveyed the bark in huge loads to Bethel. Thus they accomplished their task quickly, and also gave their neighbors a laudible example of forest protection, which lesson in this land of plenty, however, passed unheeded.

In the village smithy, which is now owned and operated by a direct descendent of the colony blacksmith, I was shown all sorts of tools that were made in the colony days. They are neat and seem to be better in many respects than the factory-made articles of today.

For the making of linseed oil the colonists resorted to the following device. A very large stone was rendered perfectly smooth and laid down horizontally. On this stone rested two circular stones, each sixty-four inches in diameter and twelve inches in thickness. They were fastened by a strong axis to a heavy rod in the middle. To this horses and mules were hitched and made to roll the heavy stones over the horizontal stone. The horses going around in a circle very much as they do in turning a canemill. The flaxseed was spread on the flat stone and the circular stones, moving over this, crushed the flaxseed into pulp, from which the oil was later extracted by intense pressure. One of these stones now rests over a public well in Bethel, the other in said to be used for a similar purpose in Shelbina.

(To be concluded.)

WILLIAM GODFREY BEK,
Instructor in Germanic Languages, University of Missouri.

NOTES.

THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

On Monday evening, December 28th, the American Historical Association and the American Political Science Association will meet in joint session in Washington to listen to the inaugural address of Mr. James Bryce as president of the latter body. Tuesday morning there will be separate sessions in Washington; in the afternoon a special train to Richmond; in the evening the presidential address of Professor George B. Adams—on Wednesday there will be papers on the Relations of Geography to History, and various other subjects. On Thursday the conference of state and local historical societies, for which Prof. St. George L. Sioussat will act as secretary, will be held, and also "round table" conferences on American colonial and Revolutionary history and in Southern history. In the evening General E. P. Alexander, C. S. A., and other officers and authorities in Civil War history will discuss the campaigns in Virginia. On New Years day there will be an excursion to Charlottesville and the University of Virginia. During the week there will be opportunity to visit the battlefields of Petersburg, Seven Pines and Yellow Tavern.

DANIEL BOONE'S REMAINS.

The legislature of Kentucky arranged for the removal of the bones of Daniel Boone from Missouri to that state, and in 1845 a commission came from Kentucky, and took back what was supposed to be his remains. It is now claimed that a mistake was made and that the wrong body was taken. As no headstone with inscription was ever placed over his grave the mistake, if there was one, was easily made, and it may now be difficult to satisfactorily decide where the body really is.

MARK TWAIN TRANSLATIONS.

In the exhibit made by the women of Connecticut at the World's Fair at Chicago was an exhibit of forty-two translations of "Uncle Tom's Cabin." The library of the British Museum has translations of the same in twenty languages. A similar exhibit of translations of Mark Twain's work would be very appropriate for the State Historical Society of Missouri, and be of great interest. The Society asks donations of all such translations for its Mark Twain collection.

DONATION OF MAGAZINES.

Dr. Zopher Case, of Warrensburg, a relative of Leonard Case, Jr., founder of the "Case School of Applied Science" at Cleveland, Ohio, has made a large donation to the Society of magazines and medical journals, they being the accumulation of many years. The medical journals include the leading ones of the country to the present time, 332 of these having been published in Missouri. The collection included in all 3990 numbers.

REVOLUTIONARY SOLDIERS BURIED IN MISSOURI.

The Review for October, 1907, contained a list of Revolutionary Soldiers buried in Missouri, compiled by the late Mary Louise Dalton, which list recorded the locality of thirty-four graves. A note in the same number of the Review added one name to the list. Late papers have added two names. William Dilday, who is buried in an old cemetery in Lawrence county, and — Ferrell or Ferrill, who is buried in the Macedonia cemetery north of Stella, in Newton county. He came with his family from Indiana about 1836, and first located on Shoal Creek, and later moved to a place about a mile north of where Stella now is, where he died in 1841. His grave in this cemetery is not now known.

REV. JESSE WALKER.

A letter from Mr. Ezra M. Prince, secretary of the McLean County Historical Society at Bloomington, Illinois, re-

ferring to the paper in the July Review on Rev. Jesse Walker, says:

"He was intimately connected with our local history. He formed the first religious organization in our county, the Blooming Grove class of the M. E. church.

The first cabin built in the county was by John Hendrix in the spring of 1822. He and his wife were ardent Methodists. The visit to them by Rev. Jesse Walker well illustrates the hardships of this pioneer missionary. The story of that visit is as follows: "One cold night in the fall of 1824 a voice was heard from without. Mr. Hendrix went to the door. A stranger sat upon a horse, and asked if he could stay over night. Mr. Hendrix replied, "Yes, come in." He said, "I can not; I am stiff with cold." Mr. Hendrix took him from his horse, carried him into his cabin and laid him before the big fire in the great fire place. He then went out and put up the horse; returning he helped the stranger to rise to a seat, and the visitor recovering said, "My name is Jesse Walker. I am a Methodist minister. I live in St. Louis. Having heard of a white family living up here among the Indians, I have come all the way to bring the gospel." He was gladly received, a short service was held, reading the Scriptures, prayer and a sermon. Shortly afterwards a "class" was formed with Mr. Hendrix as leader.

In the economy of the Methodist church, especially in its missionary stages, the class played an important part. The settlers were scattered, not enough to form churches. The visits of the missionary were infrequent, and that the religious fires kindled by these devoted men might not go out entirely the class was organized. A knot of Methodists would meet at some convenient cabin, some one of the members, distinguished for his intelligence, character, piety, zeal, and especially for his knowledge of the Bible was chosen leader. The classes were usually formed as in this case under the direction of the missionary or other regularly appointed minister of the church."

The above quotation is given from a paper read by Mr. Prince at the June meeting of the Society of which he is Secre-

tary, and is of interest in connection with the valuable article in the July number of the Review by Rev. Joab Spencer, of Slater, Missouri, in which number his name was incorrectly given as Joel.

ESPERANTO OFFICIALLY RECOGNIZED.

The United States government has lately appointed Major Paul F. Straub, of the army medical corps, to represent this country in the fourth international Esperanto Congress, held at Dresden, Germany, August 16-22, 1908. Other countries also appointed representatives to attend this Congress.

The War Department library at Washington is accumulating a collection of Esperanto literature, and the librarian of the War Department, and the superintendent of the Naval war records and library are prominent members of the Washington Esperanto Society.

There are now about 1,000 Esperanto schools and societies in the world, and there are fifty-five periodicals published in Esperanto. The Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs recommends his countrymen to study the language, which he calls the gospel of the world.

MONTANA STATE HISTORICAL LIBRARY.

Mr. William S. Bell, librarian, is doing good work for the historical interests of the State. Bulletin No. II just issued gives a general outline for a reading list on the history of the State, followed by lists of books, manuscripts, magazine and newspaper articles under the various heads. The statement is made that "every newspaper and magazine in the State is received at the library."

HISTORY TEACHERS' SOCIETY.

The Missouri Society of Teachers of History and Government adopted the Review as its official organ, and its editor, Prof. N. M. Trenholm, will conduct a department for that society. Not having returned from his vacation in time to prepare copy, the October Review unfortunately has to omit this until the next issue.

BOOK NOTES.

A Study in American Freemasonry. By Arthur Preuss, editor of the Catholic Fortnightly Review. St. Louis and Freiburg. B. Herder, 1908. 12mo., 433 p.

The above work by a valued member of this society is based upon Pike's "Morals and Dogma of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite," Mackey's works, and publications of other Masonic writers. It is written in a calm, argumentative manner, giving authorities for all the allegations that the author makes, so that no offense is felt by a Mason while reading it, though he may see the mistake of the author in the conclusion given by him.

The majority of American Masons adopt the York Rite of Masonry leading from the Blue Lodge thru the Chapter to the Commandery or Knights Templar. In the Scottish Rite leading from the same Lodge to the 33d degree, there is more of philosophic teaching, but Masons would reply to the assertions of the author, that in neither branch is there taught any concealed religion, philosophy or science, but that these are all fully set forth in the monitorial or exoteric Masonry, the esoteric Masonry being merely the forms of initiation, and not a changing or addition to the monitorial part.

Those who may be disposed to agree with the author, and those who wish to know the arguments urged against Masonry, will find the work of interest. It may be obtained of the publisher for \$1.50.

Fate's a Fiddler, by Edwin George Pinkham, illustrated by Lester Ralph. Boston, Small, Maynard & Company. 1908. 417 p.

This is one of the latest publications by a Missouri writer, one who is said to be on the Kansas City Star. The story is a good one, commencing in Boston, and transferred

to Missouri, in which State the events at St. Louis and in the mining country of the Southwest are dramatically told. The style is a strong reminder of Dickens, and a brilliant literary future is promised for the writer.

Stones in a Life. By William M. Goldsmith, student in the State Normal School, Springfield, Missouri. Springfield, Jewell Publishing Co. n. d. (C. 1908). 154 p. Portrait.

This is a pleasantly written account of stories, incidents and conversations from the real life and experience of the author, a young man who was born in Northeast Arkansas, but early moved to Campbell, Dunklin County, in this State, where he still resides. The little book will be a help to any young person who reads it.

Library and Historical Archives in North Carolina, 1900-1905. Publications of the Historical Commission, vol. 1. Raleigh, 1907. 800. 623 p.

This is a work embracing many points of history relative to the State, giving accounts of the State Literary and Historical Association, the progress of education in the State, Sir Walter Raleigh, and his colonies, reports of battles of the Revolutionary War, and those of the Civil War, and the various patriotic societies of each, bibliography of the State for 1902 to 1905, biographies of prominent men of the State, and much other matter of interest to its citizens. Many of the States are going ahead of ours in the matter of historical publications made by them.

NECROLOGY.

Hon. Thomas P. Bashaw was elected to the 30th General Assembly, 1874, and reelected to the 31st and 32d, and was Speaker of the House in the 31st, serving at the regular session in 1881 and the adjourned session in 1882.

He was born in Shelby County, Kentucky, October 31, 1843, studied law at the State University, but quit his books to enter the Confederate army. He was admitted to the bar in St. Louis in 1867, and afterwards lived at Mexico, Missouri, and later at Paris, Monroe County, from which county he was elected to the Legislature, previous to which he was elected probate judge. In 1884 he was a candidate for the nomination for Governor on the Democratic ticket, but was defeated by Governor Marmaduke. He was appointed United States District Attorney for the Eastern District of Missouri by President Cleveland in 1887. He died at his home in St. Louis, July 1, 1908.

Hon. James G. Donnell, an inspector for many years in the United States customs office at St. Louis, residing at 1820 Schild avenue, was taken dangerously ill and died on August 22, 1908. He was a member of the Missouri House of Representatives from Madison County in the 33d General Assembly in 1885.

Judge Pembroke E. Flitcraft, elected Circuit Judge in St. Louis in 1894, on the Republican ticket, serving until January 1, 1901, was born in Salem County, N. J., in 1849, and came to St. Louis in 1878. He was a graduate of the University of Michigan. He died June 17, 1908.

Dr. Homer Taylor Fuller, president of Drury College, Springfield, from 1894 to 1906, died August 15 at Saranac Lake, N. Y. He was born at Lempster, N. H., November 15,

1838, graduated from Dartmouth College in 1864, and afterward received the degrees of Ph. D. and D. D. He was connected with various educational institutions before coming to Missouri, and was the author of several monographs on educational subjects.

Rev. Dr. Henry Hopkins, from 1880 to 1902 pastor of the Second Congregational Church of Kansas City, and later president of Williams College, died in Rotterdam, Holland, August 18, 1908. He was born November 30, 1837, in Williamsburg, Massachusetts, a son of Dr. Mark Hopkins, at that time president of Williams College, and in which he graduated at the age of twenty years. He was appointed chaplain in the Union army by President Lincoln, and was stationed nearly four years in the hospitals at Alexandria. He afterwards served in the field, and was at the battles of the Wilderness and Appomattox.

Rev. James E. Hughes was born in Howard County, Missouri, March, 1821. In 1837 he moved to Clinton County, which he represented in the Legislature in the 27th General Assembly in 1873 and the adjourned session of the same in the following year. In 1843 he was ordained a minister of the Baptist Church. He was a relative of John T. Hughes of Doniphan's expedition. He died at Osborn, Missouri, August 19, 1908.

William Morgan was born in Montreal, Canada, November 18, 1839, moved to Newport, Kentucky, when a boy, and to St. Louis in 1857, where he was an auctioneer till after the Civil War. In 1873 he was appointed deputy clerk of the United States District Court, and in 1887 Judge Thayer made him clerk, which position he held till 1903. He died in St. Louis, July 7, 1908.

Gov. Eugene Semple, governor of Washington Territory during President Cleveland's first administration, died in San Diego, California, August 28, 1908. He was born in Bogota, United States of Colombia, South America, in 1840,

when his father was United States Minister at that place. He was educated in the schools of St. Louis, and in the St. Louis University, and studied law in the office of Judge Chester H. Krum. In 1870 he moved to Portland, Oregon, and afterwards resided on the Pacific coast.

Capt. Eli J. Sherlock, born in Perry County, Ohio, January 4, 1840; in the Civil War enlisted in the One Hundredth Ohio Volunteers, and in 1864 became captain. After the war he settled at Pleasant Hill, Missouri, and in 1874 was admitted to the bar. In 1878 he moved to Kansas City, where he lived till his death, August 15, 1908. During the war he kept a diary, which became four volumes, dealing with the history of the regiment to which he belonged, and which the United States Government reports as the best record of regimental histories. Capt. Sherlock wrote two books, "The Marches and Battles of the One Hundredth Ohio Infantry," and "Dictionary of American Battles."

Hon. Isaac H. Sturgeon, called "The Grand Old Man," of St. Louis, resident in a historic mansion with furniture and furnishings of ante-bellum days, and waited upon by servants who were the descendants of others who lived in the Sturgeon and Allen families before the Civil War, at a ripe old age died August 22, 1908. His public life dated back to 1848 when he was elected an alderman of St. Louis, and re-elected two years later. In 1852 he was a member of the Senate in the Seventeenth General Assembly, having for fellow members James O. Broadhead, Robert M. Stewart, Benjamin W. Grover, Wyman Crow, Thomas Allen, and other prominent men of the day. In March, 1853, he was appointed United States subtreasurer by President Pierce; reappointed in 1857 by President Buchanan; from 1861 to 1875 to various special agencies; in 1875 by President Grant, United States internal revenue collector for the First Missouri district; in 1876 reappointed by President Hayes; in 1881 reappointed by President Garfield, continued by President Arthur, and in 1885 continued by President Cleveland; 1890 appointed assistant postmaster of St. Louis by President

Harrison; in March, 1893, elected comptroller of the City of St. Louis, re-elected and held the office till 1901.

Winston Churchill was married at the Sturgeon home in 1895, his wife being a niece of Mrs. Sturgeon. The Belgrade of the "Crisis" is the old Sturgeon home, some of the characters of the novel being suggested by Mr. Sturgeon. He was born in Jefferson County, Kentucky, December 10, 1821, and studied law in Louisville. In January, 1846, he removed to St. Louis, was there admitted to the bar, but entered business pursuits. In the early days of the North Missouri Railroad, he was for twelve years its president. He was also a director in the Ohio and Mississippi Railroad, and in more than one bank. The eight presidents under whom he served all recognized him as a man of much ability, and of the highest integrity.

MISSOURI SOCIETY OF TEACHERS OF HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT.

OFFICERS FOR 1908-9.

E. M. VIOLETTE, Kirksville,
President.

H. R. TUCKER, St. Louis,
Vice President.

EUGENE FAIR, Columbia,
Secretary-Treasurer.

N. M. TRENHOLME, Columbia,
Editor.

Since the last issue of The Review Miss Anna Gilday, of the Manual Training School, has resigned as Secretary-Treasurer of the Society and Mr. Eugene Fair has kindly consented to accept the vacant office. All history teachers who wish to join the Missouri Society of Teachers of History and Government can send their names to Mr. Fair at Columbia who will gladly furnish any one with information in regard to the Society.

The work in History carried on during the summer of 1908 in the various state institutions was greater than ever before. At the State University both the undergraduate and the graduate courses were well filled and a large history enrollment was reported. The same is true of the Kirksville Normal and large and successful classes were reported from the other state normals. All this means more and better trained Teachers of History in the state and indicates the growth of the profession in thoroughness and specialization.

The next meeting of the Missouri Society of Teachers of History and Government will be held in connection with the annual meeting of the State Teachers Association at Kansas City during the coming Christmas vacation. The officers of the Society expect to provide a profitable and interesting program of papers and discussion and hope for a large attendance of history teachers from all parts of the state.

We are very glad to publish in this number of *The Review* an interesting discussion of Dunn's work, "The Community and the Citizen," by Mr. H. R. Tucker, of the McKinley High School. The interest that has been aroused in the teaching of Civics and in the relation of history and government has already done much to improve the character of the text-books and the teaching in both subjects. Mr. Tucker's review is, therefore, a timely contribution to a live topic.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTES.

Dunn, Arthur William, "The Community and the Citizen;" D. C. Heath & Co., Boston; 1907; pp. 266, viii.

As the author says: "The book is a departure from the traditional methods of presenting the subject of civics to young people." It is primarily intended for the upper grammar grade and the first year of the high school. Mr. Dunn expressly disclaims any intention to propose it as a text for the last year of the high school, when "a scientific analysis of the machinery and powers of government" is most profitably undertaken. Here then is a book which will enable any teacher to instruct her pupils within their immediate experience. The pupil is taught to study his own social world; and to do this, Mr. Dunn clearly follows essential pedagogical principles—"observation, analysis and inference." He holds—and no doubt rightly—that it is the interest of the young pupils which must be maintained. The "point of contact"—the child's and the adult's relation to his fellows—is the central aim thruout the text. The pupil studies his own environment and comes to feel he is a vital part of it.

The author makes frequent use of local history and geography, and thus correlates the two subjects—history and government—which, more and more, are coming to be considered as different phases of the same subject. For history is but the evolving of the social and political life of the people. There is much sociological material in the book, and it is presented in such simple concept and phraseology that a child can understand it. For instance, in evolving the question of getting a livelihood, the author describes, simply, the method

used by primitive man. The book also emphasizes the importance of the ethical phase of man's life, and the citizen's obligation to the community in return for the many privileges the community accords to him. It is pleasing to find a school text like this one religious (not denominational) in its tone; that is—it recognizes the religious instinct and activities of man.

The style of the book is simple and entertaining, being less formal than the ordinary text book. The illustrations are very appropriate, being new, varied, numerous, and relevant to the object matter. There are marginal analyses, a helpful addition to a text book. The author generally adopts a broad-minded attitude; for instance, in speaking of the training for citizenship, he does not ascribe to history and civics the only disciplinary power, but also mentions other branches of the curriculum as training for citizenship.

The excellent questions for investigation at the end of each chapter are prepared so as (1) to develop the pupil's power of observation; (2) to apply the principles to one's own locality, thus stimulating the interest; and (3) to set the pupils to thinking, such questions not requiring formal preparation, but simply calling for class discussion.

The references to books and the standard magazines are complete, varied and specific. They enable expansion in the work where age and time of pupils permit it. There are also references for teachers as well as for pupils.

There is one omission, which even in an elementary text, we do not see is justifiable, and that is that there is no mention at all of the territorial possessions (continental and insular) of the United States and their government. We fail to see how such a topic would have been not in harmony with the general scheme of the work, nor any more difficult than other topics considered.

The book is, however, thoroughly commendable as a departure from the usual elementary text book in civics. Furthermore, it is not the result of theory alone for it has met the test of a year's experience under the direction of the author in the school of a large city. It should be in the hands of

every teacher of history and civics of the grammar grades, for use and guidance. To the teacher of the upper high school courses in history and in civics it would offer many valuable suggestions and prove useful in supplementary work. The teaching profession would gladly welcome—we feel—a book for upper high school classes, written along the same lines as this text.—H. R. Tucker, McKinley High School, St. Louis.

A skillfully abridged and well edited version of Burg's well known "History of Greece" has been prepared for the use of American schools by Dr. Everett Kimball, of Smith College. It is published by the Macmillan Co. (\$1.10.)

The firm of Scott, Foresman and Co., of Chicago, have brought out two useful works in Roman history by Professor F. F. Abbott, of the University of Chicago. There are "A Short History of Rome," (\$1.00) and "A Handbook for the Study of Roman History," (25 cents).

Excellent review outline of Greek and Roman history have been prepared by Messrs. C. B. Newton and E. B. Treat, of the Lawrenceville School. These are published and sold by the American Book Co. at twenty-five cents each.

A new volume in the story of the Nations series deals with "The Roman Empire, B. C. 29—A. D. 476." It is by Mr. H. Stuart-Jones and deals interestingly with the general development and final collapse of the greatest of ancient empires. The publishers are G. P. Putnam Sons. (\$1.35.)

MEDIAEVAL AND MODERN HISTORY.

Professor Dow's "Atlas of European History" published by Holt and Co. (\$1.50) is the best thing of its kind available for students in Mediaeval and Modern History. It has some fifty excellent maps and a comprehensive finding index. It should largely replace the long popular little German atlas of Putzger.

Another "Source Book of Mediaeval History" has appeared this time from the precincts of Harvard, the editor being Mr. F. A. Ogg, one of the instructors in European History in Harvard University. The extracts are well selected and prefaced by clearly written explanatory notes. Altogether, this new source book appears very serviceable for school and college use and should help in the movement towards the rational use of sources. It is published by the American Book Co. (\$1.50). The Scribner's company have completed the publication of Seignobo's History of Civilization with the second volume dealing with "Mediaeval and Modern Civilization" • (\$1.25.) It is a most useful reference work for teacher in the field of European History.

For teachers of Modern European History and for advanced students there is much that is valuable and suggestive to be found in a new work by Archibald Weir entitled "An Introduction to the History of Modern Europe," published by Houghton, Mifflin and Co. (\$2.00.) It is a book that deals with underlying tendencies and forces as well as external events and indicates a thorough understanding of the trend of modern historical development.

Note—Notices of new books in English and American History have to be omitted from this number of The Review but will appear in the January number. The editor will be glad to receive any contribution from members of the Society as to reply to questions in regard to this department of The Review.

THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and that its history is a history of growth and expansion. The second is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and that its history is a history of the struggle for a common identity. The third is the fact that the United States is a nation of free men, and that its history is a history of the struggle for freedom.

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and that its history is a history of growth and expansion. The second is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and that its history is a history of the struggle for a common identity. The third is the fact that the United States is a nation of free men, and that its history is a history of the struggle for freedom.

The first of these is the fact that the United States is a young nation, and that its history is a history of growth and expansion. The second is the fact that the United States is a nation of immigrants, and that its history is a history of the struggle for a common identity. The third is the fact that the United States is a nation of free men, and that its history is a history of the struggle for freedom.







